

INDIA'S HIGHER CALL

A Plea for True Swaraj and World-Harmony
together incidentally with a Protest
against the White Paper

BY

M. K. ACHARYA

MEMBER, LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY, 1924-30,
PRESIDENT, MADRAS VARNASHRAM SWARAJYA BANGHA,
HONORARY MEMBER, BHARAT DHARMA MAHAMANDAL.

"There are philosophies in India which the nations need, and my own country most of all, for her destiny is bound up with the peoples who profess them."

—Col. F. Yeats-Brown in *THE BENGAL LANCER*



PREFACE

It is for India to show, and for England to spread over all the world, the Light of true Swaraj whether in individual or in group life. What has led me to this conclusion?

Desiring to protest against the cruel kindness of British administrators in India attempting to bring her peoples "up to Western standards of living", and of British statesmen trying to impose upon India the superficial Democracy of Numbers failing in many Western countries, I happened to be in London last year about the same time when the World Economic Conference was sitting there. From some of its Delegates I learnt how the economic and financial derangements overshadowing almost all nations were even more huge and hard of solution than the political or cultural problems of India. And I began to reflect whether India's woe and the world's at present were not both traceable to the same root-cause of Superficial Knowledge—to the false Biology that regards man as a mere animal, and subordinates his higher to his lower nature; or the false Industrialism that subordinates man to machinery; or the false Democracy that subordinates men's souls to men's hands. I began to reflect too whether in both cases, namely of India and the world at large, the remedy would not have to be drawn from the same source—of Right Knowledge,

especially of the Science and Art of Higher Life, of the *Para Vidya*, lived and taught by India's God-seers in every generation. After returning to India, and reading several expert writers on International questions, I began to feel more strongly than before that only through the Science and Art of Higher Life prized and preserved in India more than in any other country, only through the mental and moral discipline it inculcates in every-day life, can sham Democracy be replaced by true Swaraj, or International anarchy by World Harmony. May not England and India unite in spreading this Right Knowledge among all nations?

This is the burden of this little book, which consists of a series of Articles on current problems from what may be called the Indian Dharmic viewpoint. I neither expect nor desire any one to accept my conclusions without deep scrutiny. But I do desire to awaken in the reader, whether Indian or European, a genuine curiosity about the Science and Art of Higher Life, such as will lead him in due time to discover that the key to genuine Swaraj lies within himself, to Harmony likewise with All that exists.

Aum! tat, sat, Aum! May all the worlds be happy!

32, Armenian St.,
16th August 1934. }

M. K. ACHARYA.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
PREFACE	iii
I. MARRIAGE OF EAST AND WEST: An Appeal to the Britisher. (In verse).	1
II. MISSION BEFORE INDO-BRITANNIA: Western Knowledge and Eastern Culture—A Bengal Lancer's Find—Dawn of A New Era ...	4
III. INDIAN CONSTITUTIONAL REVISION: FIDDLING BEFORE FIRE: Impending World-Chaos—Proposed Tinkering Remedies—Price of Civilisation—Gambling with India ...	10
IV. ENGLAND'S MIXED SOWING IN INDIA: Modernising India—A Tug of War—A Standing Menace ...	18
V. CONSTITUTIONAL CONFABULATORS: A Hide and Seek Game—An Ill-starred Commission—An ill-equipped Committee—Round Table Show .	24
VI. PARADE OF PRINCELY INDIA: The Federal Charm—The Princes' Co-operation—Plums to supplement the Rod	32

VII.	WHITE PAPER BOMBS: Unwelcome and Perilous Gifts—A Costly White Elephant—Painted Federal Legislature—Ponderous Provincial Autonomy—Palsied Religious Neutrality—Boons or Bombs ...	37
X VIII.	DEMOCRACY NOMINAL AND REAL: Post-war Europe—Democracy of Numbers—Passing of the Old Order— <u>Democracy based on Group Organisation</u> ...	51
X IX.	THE SWARAJ GOAL: <u>What is Swaraj?</u> Evolution of the <u>Self</u> —Individual Swaraj—Group Swaraj ...	59
X.	THE PATH OF DHARMIC EVOLUTION: A Mad Rush—A Giant Vanquished by a Dwarf—An Ancient Inheritance—The Religion of Dharma ...	67
XI.	DHARMA IN INDIVIDUAL AND GROUP LIFE: Dharma as Organic Functioning—Dharmic Group Organisation. An Unquestionable Testimony ...	75
X XII.	A SWARAJ SOLDIER; Un-Indian Education in Modern India—A patriot's Protest— <u>Foundations of Swaraj</u> —Gandhian Diversions ...	84

- XIII. A SWARAJ OUTLINE: Need for Right Foundations—Rural Autonomy—District and Provincial Autonomy—Second Chambers in Provinces—Central Responsibility—All-India Federation—Protection to Religion—A Word of Caution... 93
- XIV. SOCIAL PROBLEMS OF MODERN INDIA:—Laws of Social Organisms—Reform Zeal in Modern India—"Emancipation of Indian Women"—"Elevation of the Depressed Classes," ... 102
- XV. THE MAIN MODERN PROBLEM: An Old Parable—The Giant in Modern Life—Modern Paradoxes—"A Titanic Struggle" ... 111
- XVI. LIGHT FROM THE EAST: General Awakening Needed—The Science and Art of Higher Life—The Dharmic Path—Wanted An I.D.L.. 116
- XVII. INDIA THROUGH THE AGES:—Perversions of Indologists—Truth stranger than Fiction—The Golden Link ... 124

ERRATA

Page	Line	For	Read
32	14	THE NABHA TRAGEDY	RECENT HISTORY
36	3	sl-powerful	all-powerful

INDIA'S HIGHER CALL

I. MARRIAGE OF EAST AND WEST:

AN APPEAL TO THE BRITISHER.

Hark! Brother good! what experts say
Of the crisis confronting all on earth;
How growing slump and gruesome dearth
Will sap the world's best strength away!

Against such forecast what may I
Select from out of my old-world stock,
Which will thy business brain not shock,
Which will not scare thy modern eye?

Ah me! what room be now for choice?
When the soul is hungering who will care
For loss or gain of stock or share?
Nor cry for food with all his voice?

And from thy anxious brow I guess
Thy need perchance is no less sore:
Then let us twain out of our store
Conjoint first seek our want to redress,

As willed, maybe, by Powers Above
Who for three hundred years and more

Thy sires have led, as never before,
With mine to weld in mutual love !

And then to others let us make
Request to cease from mutual strife,
And seek the common Fount of Life
Where all their varied thirst may slake.

For modern science and modern art
Far from that Fount have strayed away ;
And have helped the Beast in man to sway
Over the God within his heart !

And all the conquests that they claim
On land and sea, o'er time and space,
Have only armed the human race
To fight each other with deadly aim,

Ignoring man is not alone .
Of eating, mating animal-kind,
With brain or body more refined,
But a spark of the highest, holiest One !

Thus hath the modern world been led
By false mirage to ruin's brink ;
From which good many seem to shrink,
But know not where to turn and tread.

And yet, from holy lips and pure
I've heard—wilt thou the secret share ?—
How thou and I today may dare
To point to where lies safety sure :

To point how but the Self can save—
The potent Self that lies confined
Beyond all earthly sciences' find
Deep in the heart's unfathomed cave ;

Or that awakened doth abide
In family, tribe, and nation free,
In all mankind, in all that be,
As his habitat grows each day more wide !

So now let earthly sciences learn
To culminate in the Science of the Soul ;
In the boundless life of the deathless Whole
For whose true Bliss all blindly yearn.

'Tis thus all conflicts here below [want,
'Tween man and machine, or wealth and
Or rulers and ruled, we may supplant
By the Life that links all high and low ;

Thus may with Discipline Liberty weld,
And unto Duty yield place Right ;
And wealth in service find delight,
And power with self-restraint be held ;

Thus true Swaraj in every sphere
May spread where sham Democracy sways ;
Thus all through diverse *dharmaic* ways
To the Fount of Life draw hourly near ;

Thus may the Marriage of East and West
 Help both their united strength to feel;
 Help all the world to grow in weal,
 And of Life's harvest reap the best!

Aum, tat sat, aum! Peace be to all beings!

II. MISSION BEFORE INDO-BRITANNIA

WESTERN KNOWLEDGE AND EASTERN CULTURE:—
 The West is proud of its scientific knowledge, of its wonderful discoveries and inventions, through which it claims to have conquered the limitations of time and space, and added immensely to the amenities of every-day life. Its conquests over external nature, however, have only allured it farther away than ever before from the inner Fount of Life. Wherefore, speaking comparatively, there have been during the past two, three hundred years, hardly half-a-dozen great thinkers or writers on the higher problems of life. How indeed can there be in a whirling age of motors and cinemas, of cheap novels and newspapers, of insatiate sense-craving among high and low alike? Whatever the reason be, it is unfortunate that independent investigators into the value of modern institutions like the author of *Democracy: Its Causes and Its Cure*, or of *The Spiritual Basis of Democracy*, or like the talented authoress of the *New State*,

have not sprung in larger numbers. And yet, sooner perhaps than most people may foresee, there is bound to come a change in the cheap stereo-thinking of the West. Through the "World-Chaos" that now confronts them, leaders are being forced to inquire into the real value of current shibboleths, and to find out more serious and satisfactory solutions to economic and political, as well as to higer problems of life. The slave-mentality of the average English-educated Indian will perhaps wait till then to discover the perils of the guilded civilisation and democracy that they are hankering after. May it not be too late then whether in India's or in England's higher interests? Yes; the intellectual bonds of modern India are more terrible than her political. Most of the current notions about India's past history or her present problems are the outcome of superficial study whether among Indian or European "scholars". They require re-investigation and reconstruction on independent lines. It will be well if Indians recognise the difficulties which foreigners, in general, brought up in hide-bound traditions of their own of which they are naturally proud, have to face when they have to deal with old cultures which, strangely in their view, have stood the ravages of time. The fruits of earthly knowledge fall and fester apace; the manna of heavenly culture flows from generation to generation in unbroken con-

tinuity. The militant civilisation of the West aims at sense-gratification through control of the forces of external nature; the saintly culture of India aims through sense-control at realising the blissful Divinity deep seated in the heart of all beings. Devotion to Dharma, to discipline in every-day life has been the watchword of India from her first dawn of life on earth. But only a spiritually-inclined eye, of which the possessor himself is oftentimes long unaware, can detect the inner greatness of India's Dharmic Culture; only a Col. Olcott not Lord Macaulay, only a Mrs. Besant or Sister Nivedita not a Miss Mayo or Patricia Kendal, only a Justice Woodroffe not a Major Cadogan or even a Lord Meston to whom the disciplinary rules of Hinduism are only evidences of Caste-tyranny and superstition.

A BENGAL LANCER'S FIND:—But who on earth could have dreamt that to a British soldier in the Indian Army with little claim to scholarship of any kind would have fallen the privilege of coming into close contact with God-seers and spiritual aspirants who had transcended the cravings of the lower self; nay the still greater privilege of himself seeking to enter "the temple of the undistracted mind"? This indeed was the blessed lot of a "Bengal Lancer" (Col. F. Yeats-Brown), who in a most readable and instructive book bearing that same name has recorded his wonderful experiences among the

half-clad "barbarians" of India. Not all his polo and pig-sticking, not all his military duties nor vicissitudes of war could quench his inner flame. Eventually, one evening, at Kathgodam in U. P. whither he went seemingly on a holiday trip, but really to overtake a God-seer who had started earlier for the Himalayan regions, drinking "the infinite serenity of the cow-dust hour", the author describes how "as background to this persuasive peace stood the Himalayas, white and holy, their summits reaching into an after-glow of crimson... Would it be my work, I wondered, to tell the West a little of what may be discovered there, and how Christ Himself threw the light of His Divinity upon the truths that were known in the childhood of the Vedas? The task was broad and big as the plains I traversed, and my equipment scanty. Would any one listen to the stammering of a soldier? I knew little then except by instinct. And today I have learnt only the extent of my ignorance; but I know that even that is worth recording, for others will take up the tale. There are philosophies in India which the nations need, and my own country most of all, for her destiny is bound with the peoples who profess them".

DAWN OF A NEW ERA:—Yes; amidst the gloom of the night through which we are passing, glimpses of approaching dawn are perceptible to the sentinel's eye; through the very chaos that now

confronts all nations on earth, they shall learn the path to true peace and harmony. But whose shall be the privilege to hail the first streaks of the approaching dawn? The "Destiny that shapes our ends, rough hew them how we will," has linked together England and India as custodians respectively of the Civilisation of the West and the Culture of the East, in order evidently that the two may be harmoniously blended for the benefit of the world at large. But these, to qualify themselves for their joint mission, should at once learn to get over their petty vanities and prejudices. The Britisher should cease to harp on the blessings of Pax Britannica, to muse on the "White man's burden", to claim that his work in India has been either far-sighted, or altruistic: he should see how it has throughout been haphazard, and for "good consideration" at every period. The Indian Nationalist, on the other hand, should cease to declaim against the "triple enslavement of India—economic, political cultural—by Britain:" no such enslavement would have been possible, had there been any real "national" strength in India. It will be well for us to realise that if Modern India cannot go back to the days of Asoka or even of Akbar, neither can she be transformed into a Canada or Russia; that least of all will such transformation be desirable. Likewise it will be well if the Britisher can realise at once the root-cause of the impending

“world-chaos”; if he can recognise clearly the perils of uncontrolled power. For, as Bertrand (Earl) Russell has succinctly pointed out in his Introduction to Mr. Wellock’s *Spiritual Basis of Democracy*, “Science has shown how to achieve our immediate purposes far more successfully than former ages would have deemed it possible. We can manufacture commodities with a hundredth of the labour required in pre-industrial times; we can move on the surface of the earth with ten times the velocity of a hundred years ago. We can fly better than birds, and move under the water faster than fishes. Unfortunately the intellectual powers which have led to these achievements are not accompanied by corresponding moral powers. . . . The dominant nations of the world have used this scientific knowledge for two purposes: to increase the material comfort of the wealthy minority, and to perfect the means of slaughtering each other. . . . There is no issue from this situation except in a new philosophy of life. . . . Is there any hope that this will be successfully achieved in Europe? Probably, not until we have all tasted the extremity of despair, and learnt something of that humility in the face of Nature which machines have destroyed. In the East there is more hope”. Yes; the “new philosophy of life” which will save the modern world will be evolved by the fusion of the higher genius of India

and of England; for India has always stood for Unity in the midst of Diversity, for Peace along with Action, for self-restraint in the wake of expanding power; while England is the most conservative among modern nations, aiming at progress on orderly lines. Will Indo-Britannia courageously fulfil her mission undeterred by the din of the chaos around?

III. INDIAN CONSTITUTIONAL REVISION:

FIDDLING BEFORE FIRE.

IMPENDING WORLD CHAOS:—Experts in International Finance, Economics, Politics are of opinion that the “civilised” world at present is on the brink of a terrible crisis. The practical failure of the World Economic and Disarmament Conferences; the growing impotency of the League of Nations, the rise of military Dictatorships in Italy, Germany, Russia, and in Ireland, the outburst of political revolution and chaos in Spain and France, the rumbling of war-thunders in the Far East, above all, the international “Slump” in trade, “unparalleled in the memory of man”—all this is pointed out as outward indications of the inner chaos which is spreading among all peoples on earth, of “the international anarchy” which is said to assail all forms of Government at the present

day. It is, for instance, pointed out that the barren results of the Disarmament Conference are not due to any lack of intellectual realisation by its members, or by the Governments they represent, of the terrible mass destruction of life and property that would flow from any war with the latest scientific weapons. None can deny the force of Lord Halsbury's graphic statement that "one single bomb filled with modern asphyxiating gas would kill everybody in an area from Regent Park to the Thames". Nor could any deny that the military charges fall heavily on the finances of almost every country; according to an expert calculation, the chief world-powers during the past four or five years of peace have together been spending upon their armaments four thousand million dollars or over £1,000,000,000 per year. Yet the "bloody traffic" in arms, as Mr. Fenner Brockway tellingly describes in a book bearing that same name, is only growing in volume every day; for the industrial concerns engaged in such traffic exert no small influence in each country upon the Parliament that votes the expenditure. The economic tale is even more depressing. Writing about the World Economic Depression of 1929-31, Mr. H. G. Wells says: "Never before has the industrial and commercial intelligence of mankind shown to such complete disadvantage as at the present time." This "Depression" of

1931 far from being satisfactorily solved by scientific experts has developed into a Slump "unparalleled in the memory of man", which Mr. G. D. Cole describes in his *Guide to World Chaos*. Political experts say that in few countries, even where they are not paralysed by internal revolutions, are the governments able to find any satisfactory remedy against the chaos that confronts them on every side.

PROPOSED TINKERING REMEDIES:—The fact is that the economic, financial, and political institutions of the nineteenth century are fast disintegrating; they require to be radically and speedily overhauled. But by whom? and how? Can they be peacefully remoulded? Or will the overhauling come through violent revolution? As yet there seems to be little evidence of attempts towards peaceful reconstruction; because the "experts", though they perceive the magnitude of the impending crisis, have not yet diagnosed aright the malady for which they have to prescribe a cure. Indeed the majority of leaders and thinkers in the West do not yet realise that the present generation is only reaping the bitter fruits of the beastly "civilisation" that has been fondly and proudly cherished during the past three hundred years and more. So they can only suggest some kind of "world federation", or some form of economic and financial "world-controls" to minimise the evils of excessive

nationalism which, in their opinion, is the main obstacle now to international peace and progress. They do not explain how any such future Federation or Control will function more efficiently than the present League of Nations or its Committees. Indeed the remedies suggested are more or less in the way of putting a new Presbyterian in the place of the old priest. Some feel the situation so desperate as to make them think that no effective check can be found for the psychology behind "economic nationalism" and "unplanned capitalism" except through a bloody, terrible revolution which will halve the population of the world. Others, again, like the Marquess of Lothian, hope that "in some way"—though they cannot indicate it—"anarchy will be ended; ... for, otherwise, civilised society will be impossible." Naturally, to those born and bred amidst the gorgeous material paraphernalia of the modern world it must be difficult to conceive of any civilised society, of any national or international safety without at least a minimum number of dread-noughts, and machine-guns, and ærobombs, or of world-weal and progress without motor cars and æroplanes, without perhaps taverns and tea-shops, and cinemas and cigarettes as well; for all these together seem to be regarded as the *sine qua non* of "civilisation."

PRICE OF CIVILISATION:—Thus we are asked to regard—by Mr. H. G. Wells for instance, in his

Work, Wealth, and Happiness of Mankind—as proof of the rapid progress made in the West, “that in 1897 there were ninety motor cars upon the roads of the United States; in 1906 the hundred thousand mark was passed; in 1913 the million; in 1928 twenty-one millions. There is now (in 1931) a car to every seven people in the United States, and to every sixty people in Great Britain and France.” What, however, may be the expenditure involved in manufacturing and maintaining all these countless millions of cars in Europe and America, that are an incontrovertible proof of the superior civilisation of the West? We have already noted the cost of up-to-date armaments among the world’s chief powers. To take another example: Fifty years ago there were neither machine-made cigarets nor cinemas in the world, which was to that extent then uncivilised belike. But, now, how many know at what price they are purchasing these latest boons? In 1929-30, in Great Britain, Custom Duties on Tobacco came to £62,900,202; so adding to this the value of the commodity, the cost of manufacture, trade profits *et cetera*, the total cost paid by consumers could not be less than 200 millions sterling. In the U. S. A., according to an American Weekly, “two billion dollars are spent annually on tobacco.” Again, it is estimated “that two thousand billion dollars are invested in the Picture Show Industry in

America; . . . that a hundred million attend picture shows every week; . . . that from among these cinema-goers seventy-five thousand girls disappeared from American homes in 1929". All this of course to a Miss Mayo or a Patricia Kendell may seem evidence of growing liberty and equality in America. Again according to statistics collected by Mr. H. G. Wells, "the factory value of perfumes and other toilet preparations manufactured in the United States alone was 207,461,839 dollars" in 1929 . . . "But profits in this trade run high; . . . the gross total at the consumers' end cannot fall short of 500,000,000 dollars." Likewise "there are a million women in the United States alone with an average annual expenditure of something like £100" on Cosmetics. Of course other "modern" countries dare not lag far behind the standard of civilisation set by America. India—God be thanked!—has not yet taken, not at least in the same measure, to these civilised ways; although her official guardians strive and expect that she may soon do so! Thus in *India in 1928—29*, published by the Government of India, "for presentation to Parliament", we read: "Additional evidence of India's growing prosperity can be had from the Railway statistics which show even the poorest classes can afford to travel much more than in the past. *India's millions too are now enjoying vast quantities of cigarettes,*

mineral waters, and other simple luxuries, all pointing to the fact that the standard of living among the Indian masses is slowly but surely rising". (The italics are mine.) This, however, is by the way. The statistical figures quoted above should suffice to indicate to the earnest enquirer how the world's present economic deadlock is all the price paid for a "civilisation" that has but enthroned the Beast in man in place of the God within. How many European and American experts realise this?

GAMBLING WITH INDIA:—In the midst of such colossal world-distress, how tragic it is that those who are supposed to be the rulers or leaders of Modern India are busy precipitating her into the same chaos industrial, economic, political, social, which is paralysing most modern countries. I am referring to those who in season and out declare that no real progress can be achieved by India until her social and religious barriers are all broken, or until she is industrialised on up-to-date lines. I am referring to the politicians both in England and in India who have been busy these four years trying to devise a "democratic" Constitution for India on the British pattern. I am referring to those who pin their faith to the "White Paper", although its recommendations have neither satisfied India's vocal politicians, nor are likely to benefit India's voiceless millions, despite Sir Samuel Hoare's cheap rhetoric in the House of

Commons that the reforms proposed by him would give to the agricultural masses living in India "a chance to make their voices heard in every single matter affecting them from day to day and from year to year." It is no doubt difficult for British statesmen whether in or out of office to understand the real life of the masses in India. But how many among India's vocal politicians understand it aright? How many among these realise the force of the great C. R. Das's loud protest against Provincial Autonomy and Central Responsibility on the present foundations? How many realise that such Responsibility based on any franchise however low or even nominal will vest all power in the middle-class leaders, none in the people in the villages who care not for such franchise? Perhaps the Indian Liberals are too Westernised in mind to aspire for anything higher or more beneficial than "Dominion Status." But have the most independent Congressmen anything better to their credit than perhaps the mendacious Nehru Committee's Report? How many know that Das's Swaraj scheme differs from the Nehru Committee's as fundamentally as light differs from darkness? Without an alternative scheme on truly national lines, that is on lines adapted to the national genius, of what value is all the political fanfaranading that is witnessed in India to-day? India's voiceless millions cry for bread; her vocal politicians offer a stone;

and quarrel among themselves over what shape or name it should bear. What fiddling before fire can be more reprehensible ?

IV. ENGLAND'S MIXED SOWING IN INDIA

MODERNISING INDIA :—To gauge the full import of the constitutional bombs projected in the "White Paper", it is necessary to refer, however briefly, to the attempts that have been made during the past one hundred years and more to impose upon India Western institutions and standards in educational and cultural, in economic and political, nay in social and religious spheres as well. The story of British India dates from about 1750. During the first fifty years the British servants of the East India Co. confined themselves more to their profits of trade than to the privileges of a rule that was unexpectedly falling into their hands. During the next fifty years they had to relinquish their trade, and to play the role of administrators and statesmen in all seriousness, to find solutions to the many complicated problems that arose in their rule over vast territories and diverse interests and communities. Their qualification for such task was not high ; they naturally committed many blunders. It was during this period that the great Macaulay came to India, who, his colossal race-

vanity apart, desired that the Britisher according to his lights should do his best for the peoples of India. In his supreme ignorance of Oriental languages and Culture, Macaulay declared that "a single shelf of a good European library was worth all the native literature of India and of Arabia"; and so persuaded Government to resolve upon introducing English higher education into India. "It may be," Macaulay foresaw, "that the public mind of India may expand under our system till it has outgrown that system;...that having become instructed in European knowledge they (Indian subjects) may in some future age demand European institutions. Whether such a day will ever come I know not. But never will I attempt to avert or retard it". "Such a day" came—not in "some future age", but within fifty short years after Macaulay's time; when thousands of Indians, "having become instructed in European knowledge" began only too slavishly and too persistently to clamour for European institutions economic, political, social. Few of them had the genius to blend into harmony all that they found best in the West and in the East for the benefit of India and the world at large. Most of them were Indian only in body, and Western in thought and ideals. They thus became ardent advocates of extreme social and political reform. The Britishers in India warmly encouraged the attempts

of these half-educated heterodox Indians at rabid social and religious reforms; but resented when these, in the name of Self-Government, demanded the steady transference of all political power from the hands of the British into their own.

A TUG OF WAR:—It is true that these English-educated Indians form a microscopic minority of the total Indian population. They are not more than five millions at present. But they are, comparatively speaking, too vocal to be ignored. Moreover from their ranks have been recruited the subordinate officials without whom the daily administration cannot be run. From their ranks have sprung the Indian Moderates or Liberals who have been the prize-boys of, and useful to the Bureaucracy as against their more ardent and less compromising compatriots. Lastly, British prestige could not stand the charge of broken pledges levelled against it loudly from time to time. So, during the past forty or fifty years, the British Government in India have tried to adopt towards Indian politicians a policy which may be summed up as one of stern repression with one hand, and slow reform with the other. Old weapons of autocracy in the armoury of the John Company were refurbished, especially the notorious Regulation III of 1818 under which the Executive can arrest and imprison any man, prince or peasant, for any length of time, without any open charge or

trial ; new repressive laws were also enacted. But repression only made the leaders more popular on whom the rod of Government fell. Reform therefore had to be introduced in ever-increasing measure to conciliate the politically-minded. This is the psychology behind the Minto-Morley Reforms of 1909, as well as the Montagu-Chelmsford Reforms of 1919 ; nay behind the Round Table shows of recent years. The Act of 1919 recognised India's Right to Responsible Government, but enunciated the novel doctrine of the "progressive realisation" of the same by "successive stages" to be determined by the British Parliament ; it immediately introduced "Dyarchy" in the Provinces, that is, placed certain Departments in charge of Ministers chosen from and responsible to the Provincial Legislatures ; it enlarged these Legislatures ; and installed a bicameral Central Legislature with a large Non-official majority, by whose decisions, however, the Central Executive that continued to be irremovable and irresponsible, were not necessarily bound. These provisions, liberal perhaps when compared to what had preceded them, were declared by Indian politicians to be unsatisfactory, and inadequate. Public opinion in India, at the time, ran indeed so high against these reforms, that Mr. Gandhi, an expert in exploiting mass psychology, launched in 1921 his Non-Co-operation or Civil Disobedience

Movement, under which hundreds of patriots in every Province defied Government's authority, and cheerfully marched to the prison-house. This movement succeeded in breaking the prestige of the British lion, but not in winning Swaraj for India*. But Mr. Gandhi apart, what intelligent student of the movements witnessed in India during the past fifty years can resist the conclusion that whether for the rabid attempts at socio-religious legislation made by half-read heterodox Indians on the one hand, or on the other hand for the insistent demand for full Responsible Government made by India's vocal politicians, whether for the Civil Disobedience Movement of Mr. Gandhi's, or for the Cult of the Bomb imported into India from Western anarchists, England's own mixed sowing in India is largely responsible ?

A **STANDING MENACE**:—India, however, has not much to fear from superficial Gandhism or surreptitious Terrorism. Mr. Gandhi has at last openly abjured his Civil Disobedience Movement, and is

* For Mr. Gandhi's genius is preeminently destructive, not constructive. He is not a God-seer who has transcended the "pleasure and pain, or profit and loss" of the phenomenal world, nor a gifted statesman that can perceive the elements of Unity in Diversity, or evolve harmony out of discord. He is an emotional reformer who got his inspiration not from the Lord Sri Krishna but from Count Leo Tolstoy; whose restlessness is quite of the West not of the East; whose unwisdom fructifies in "Himalayan" blunders, and whose repentance manifests in dramatic penances.

practically a spent force in Indian politics. He is now dabbling in religion—a sphere in which his superficial knowledge and destructive talents can only lead him into blunders more “Himalayan” than any he has till now committed. Similarly Terrorism is of exotic origin ; and although it may find a hiding place in the hearts of a few reckless dupes, it can never thrive in India’s burning sun. India’s sober genius apprehends far greater danger from the pernicious “civilisation” which, wherever it spreads, incites men and women alike to use all their higher intelligence for the gratification of their lower, beastly cravings. The leavening of English education—Godless, sceptic, soul-killing—as already noted, has brought into existence thousands of men—and alas ! scores of women too—who “laugh at their priests and scoff at the missionaries,” talk glibly of Liberty and Equality, rebel against all irksome social and religious disciplinary regulations, and are, in a word, advocates of Bolshevism as much in Economics and Politics as in Sociology and Religion. This is India’s greatest grief—the slave-mentality of those who claim to be educated, who claim to be the leaders of modern India ; whom Government too cheaply regards as India’s accredited leaders. Is it any wonder that a Government that looks to these as its guides in Indian controversial matters is fast coming to commit suicide in India ?

V. CONSTITUTIONAL CONFABULATORS

A HIDE-AND-SEEK GAME:—Since 1921, when the Legislatures under the Montford scheme were inaugurated, the Officialdom in India has occupied quite an anomalous constitutional position. They are not autocrats as their predecessors long had been ; nor are they responsible to the Indian people or their representatives. This added to the idiosyncracies of changing governments in England and changing Viceroy's in India, has resulted in a kind of hide-and-seek game between the Government and India's vocal politicians. The entry of the Swarajists into the reformed Legislatures in 1924 helped Government in one way to break the strength of Mr. Gandhi's Non-Co-operation Movement ; but in another way it added to the Government's troubles ; for the Swarajists were pledged to demand an immediate revision of the Act of 1919 ; and this they did from within the legislatures either by refusing to vote the salaries of Ministers in certain Provinces, or by carrying specific Resolutions in the Legislative Assembly demanding immediate revision. This Swarajist pressure forced Government to appoint the "Muddiman Committee" in 1924-25 ; whose recommendations, however, fell far short of what the Swarajists desired. They therefore renewed their Resolution for immediate Constitutional revision in 1927. By this time the

Government found that the Act itself of 1919 required the appointment of a Commission, within a period of ten years "from the commencement of the Act," to enquire into the working of the Act, and to recommend what further extension, or else restriction, the 'Commission deemed desirable. This was the genesis of the Statutory Commission under Sir John Simon appointed by Parliament at the end of 1927. In the meantime the Officials challenged the vocal politicians of India to produce an alternative scheme of their own acceptable to all communities and interests in British India. This was the genesis of the All Parties' Conference convened in the summer of 1928, which Conference appointed a Committee with Pandit Motilal Nehru as Chairman to draft a Responsible Constitution for the people of India. The trial of strength was now between the Simon Commission and the Nehru Committee; but as the sequel would show, Government declined to pin their faith to either.

AN ILL-STARRED COMMISSION:—Indian "public opinion" from the outset, was furiously opposed to the Statutory Commission. It resented the idea of an examination of India's fitness by British politicians. Nor did the addition later of an Indian complement to the British personnel lessen the initial prejudice against the Commission. India's vocal politicians declared a vigorous boycott of it; and arrangements for the boycott were projected

apace as reported in the Indian "nationalist" papers. In any case there can be no denying the fact that the Indians who welcomed the Commission were not people who had earned the esteem and confidence of their countrymen : some of them like the "Justicites" of Madras had achieved greatness more through hatred of the English-educated Brahmin than by any positive merits of their own ; others like the leaders of the "Depressed Classes" had greatness thrust upon them by the fiat of a soul-less bureaucracy. The more respectable among India's vocal politicians supplemented by the enthusiasm of young India did loudly non-co-operate with Sir John Simon and his colleagues ; and the officials in every Province had to take the most rigid precautions to ensure the safe tour and work of the Commissioners while in India. Thus the commission failed in one of its chief objectives, namely, to placate vocal India. All the same it brought out in due course a full Report of all its adventures and discoveries ; and it recommended that the next stage might be ushered on the Montford plan, namely Provincial Autonomy as the logical expansion of Dyarchy. This recommendation of course was loudly condemned by vocal India as inadequate ; and it did not commend itself even to Government—not at least in the manner expected.

AN ILL-EQUIPPED COMMITTEE:—About the same time appeared the Nehru Committee's Report, or perhaps a little earlier even; which because of its claim to have behind it the acceptance of all political parties in India, seems to have received due consideration at the hands of Lord Irwin's government. But the Committee, in truth, was ill equipped for the task undertaken by it, namely of devising a dynamic plan that will evolve the right kind of Unity and Harmony from amidst the diversities and discords of modern India. Pandit Motilal Nehru, for instance, who had lived all his life in woeful ignorance and contempt of India's higher life and culture was the President; and Sir A. P. Patro was the Secretary of the Committee, who hated not only the Brahmins of modern India who had proved too much for him whether in law or in politics, but also the discipline in every-day life which Brahminism has stood for through the ages; and most of the other members of the Committee were only political bargainers on behalf of sundry communities, parties and interests. In a word, not a single member possessed the vision and fire of a Vivekananda or a Das—both of whom, by the way, had been Non-brahmins by birth—which alone could inspire all the diverse currents in India to unite in one harmonious flood. And so the members of this Committee were more anxious to satisfy one another in the first place, and in the second place

to plan to get rid of the British Bureaucracy, than either to plan the necessary foundations for Swaraj or sketch an edifice on satisfactory lines. The Committee tried in a slavish manner to cull from the Constitutions of various countries, of the British Dominions chiefly, the materials with which they constructed quite mechanically their "Commonwealth of India." The Committee's foremost demand was with reference to India's Constitutional Status. They desired that India "shall have the same status in the comity of Nations known as the British Empire, as the Dominion of Canada, the Commonwealth of Australia ., . with a Parliament having power to make laws for the peace, order and good government of India, and an Executive responsible to that Parliament and shall be styled the Commonwealth of India." All individual, communal, and minority interests within this projected Commonwealth the Committee sought to safeguard by a "Declaration of Fundamental Rights," and secondly, by means of "Adult Suffrage" combined, during the transitory period, with "reservation of seats" in the Provincial and Central Legislatures, on the population ratio of the Communities that might seek protection. The demand for immediate Adult Suffrage may be taken as typical of the Committee's indifference to existing conditions on the one hand, and on the other hand of their slavish imitation of

foreign models taken from countries which perhaps have not been in existence for more than a few hundred years.

AN IMPOSING SHOW:—The Nehru Committee's Report, although its recommendations were superficial, and based on undigested foreign models, yet because of its claim to be an "All-Parties' Draft," came to receive ample consideration at the hands of the Government of India. In fact, Lord Irwin, the Viceroy, paid a special visit to England in 1929; and after discussions no doubt with the Cabinet there, he returned to India and announced Government's proposal to summon a Round Table Conference in London at which all Parties and interests in India through their accredited representatives might confer with the representatives of Great Britain, and settle the lines of the future Indian Constitution. The Conference was duly inaugurated in London by His Majesty the King-Emperor on the 12th November, 1930; and as many as 90 Delegates—16 British, 17 from the Indian States, and the rest from British India—took part in the Conference, which closed with the British Premier's sympathetic and hopeful speech on 19th January, 1931. A second session of the R.T.C. was held from 7th September to 1st December, in 1931; and in this Mr. Gandhi also participated, suspending his Salt Satyagraha, on behalf of the Congress. And a Third Session

too, was held from 17th November to 24th December, 1932. In these Round Table Conferences, *it is claimed* that representatives of Indian States, representatives of various Parties or communities and interests in British India met representatives of British Parties, and discussed freely all relevant issues, discussed freely alternative schemes and proposals; and that through various Committees, such as on "Federal Structure," Finance, Franchise, Minorities, *et cetera*, they arrived at conclusions acceptable in the main to all concerned. The claim, however, is quite magnified. The Congress for instance did not participate either in the first or in the third Conference. The Orthodox Hindu Majority had a single representative at the first and second Conferences, and none at the third at all, although they had disclaimed all connection with more vocal bodies like the Congress and the Liberal Federation. The Britisher respects only those whom he fears: how can he care much for Orthodox Hindus who, whatever their numbers, have till now been too loyal and peaceful to give any trouble to the British Government, nor even sufficiently vociferous? The Orthodox Hindus, on the other hand, had made it clear from the beginning that they wanted not Democracy on shallow, Western lines, but Swaraj broad-based on wide-spread Rural Autonomy. This evidently was their unpardonable sin.

The Government in fact took care to ensure that the spokesmen from India were all unquestioning votaries at the shrine of modern "civilisation." Thus the bulk of their nominees on the R. T. C. s, and later on the Joint Parliamentary Committee, were drawn from the Indian Liberals—leaders all with few followers; to whom were added the spokesmen of communal and special interests, and, for reasons which we shall presently note, representatives of certain Indian States. It is true that Lord Irwin in 1931 even at the cost of the prestige of his Government made peace with Mr. Gandhi, released him from his Salt-Satyagraha imprisonment, and sent him up to the second R. T. C. But Mr. Gandhi went there only to offer his ultimatum calling on the Britisher to clear out; he participated little in the Conference discussions. No doubt, from a spectacular standpoint there was much in these Conferences—at least in the first—to impress the imagination. The first Round Table Conference, as already noted, assembled on the 12th November, 1930, in the stately Royal Gallery of the House of Lords. The King-Emperor whose solicitude for India is well known, inaugurated the Conference in a moving speech; indeed, after welcoming the representatives of the Princes, and chiefs and Peoples of India, he bade them and his British Ministers and statesmen to remember the "momentous character of the task to which

they had set their hands." His Majesty declared: "I shall follow the course of your proceedings with the closest and most sympathetic interest, not indeed without anxiety but with a greater confidence. The material conditions which surround the lives of my subjects in India affect me nearly, and will be ever present in your thoughts in your forthcoming deliberations...I pray that Providence may grant to you in bounteous measure wisdom, patience and goodwill." And the words doubtless touched the hearts, for the moment at least, of the hearers who formed an imposing array.

VI. PARADE OF PRINCELY INDIA

IN THE LIGHT OF THE NABHA TRAGEDY.

THE FEDERAL CHARM:—The very fact that as many as sixteen representatives of Indian States along with over fifty delegates from British India had been invited to confer in London, indicates that from the beginning the R. T. C. was intended to deal with some scheme of All-India Federation. At what exact time, through whom or from what source, whether from the Simon Commission's Report or from elsewhere, whether on its own intrinsic merits or as a move against the demand for immediate Central Responsibility, the Federal idea was hit upon, is not known; but that it was

definitely present in the minds of those who convened the first R. T. C. cannot be doubted. Thus the very first Draft Resolution which the Conference was asked to discuss was on the "question whether the future Government of India should be on a Federal or Unitary basis." This discussion lasted for five days, during which some forty eloquent speeches, nine being from States' Delegates, were delivered approving whole-heartedly the Federal goal. The Conference then proceeded to appoint a number of Committees, of which the biggest and most imposing was on Federal Structure; on this Committee, again, a good number of States' representatives were members. It is needless to go into further details, as perhaps there will be none to question the hypothesis that it was for the very definite purpose of considering and of approving, if possible, some Federal scheme that representatives of both British India and the States were summoned. That the Federal ideal should evoke great enthusiasm at the beginning from all delegates, whether of British or Indian India, was perhaps natural. It was perhaps equally natural that the details discussed in the various Committees and Sub-Committees—such as those regarding the component elements of the Federation, the type of Federal Legislature desirable, its powers and relations with the Federal Executive and so on, and, above all else, the forecasts regarding the Financial

Relations that will subsist between the Federation and its component units—that these details should reveal the difficulties that had to be overcome before the Federal idea could be brought into the region of practical politics.

THE PRINCES' CO-OPERATION:—From a perusal of the various Reports and Proceedings that have been published, the conclusion is irresistible that the Federal Plan, notwithstanding the backing given to it in the White Paper officially, cannot develop into completion in the near future. This will be due primarily to the hugeness and complexity and novelty of the experiment sought to be made, and only secondarily to the willingness or unwillingness of Indian Rulers to surrender their so-called "sovereign" rights, and enter into the proposed Federation. Wherefore both the public question whether Indian Princes are being coerced into entering the Federation, and the categorical denials thereof, are premature if not irrelevant to the intrinsic soundness or unsoundness of the White Paper Scheme. For one thing, almost every Indian "schoolboy" knows that the Princes, despite their high-sounding titles on ceremonial occasions, do not enjoy as much freedom of speech and action as the citizens of British India; he knows how the Princes have to live and move in perpetual terror of the Political Department. For this is the one Department of the Government of

India which is as autocratic to-day as it was in the days of the East India Company. Into its terrible gloom the light of day has not penetrated, and cannot penetrate. There is a mystery overhanging it as deep as Death, a most sweet and silent poison in its atmosphere, after imbibing which the most capable and just and freedom-loving officer becomes unconsciously an autocrat. The Department is in the hands of the Governor-General directly; and, under the present constitution, no motion can be brought forward in the Central Legislature regarding the Department's activities without the "previous sanction" of the Governor-General, that is to say, without the consent of the Department itself. Again in India the Political Department is also what in Europe is called the Diplomatic Service. In Europe, according to Prof. Alison Phillips, "Diplomacy . . . resolved itself into a process of exalted haggling, conducted with an amazing disregard for the ordinary standards of morality, but with the most exquisite politeness". In India, since the days of Wellesley it has consisted in a process of exalted seizing performed in "disregard of all ordinary standards of morality, but with the most exquisite politeness". Indian Princes know all this only too well. They know too from examples placed before them from time to time, in flesh and blood—such as, in recent years, of Nabha, of Alwar, of

Dewas Senior—what dread lot awaits the hapless Indian ruler who chances, however unwittingly, to incur the displeasure of this all-powerful and all-irresponsible Department. With the above-mentioned telling examples before him, what Indian ruler who desires his own safety can fail to take the cue from his masters—whether in hailing the Federation ideal, or in hesitating over the Federation details?

PLUMS TO SUPPLEMENT THE ROD:—Or, from instances like these, what intelligent reader will fail to conclude that the Political Department of the Government of India like a veteran drill-master can marshall the Princes of India into whatever parade it chooses? The Department, however, is too shrewd not to know that by merely flourishing its rod it may not be able to impose its fiat upon major historic States like Hyderabad or Mysore or Baroda. The temptation therefore is held out to these that entry into the proposed Federation will bring them certain specific benefits. That is how, as the Duchess of Atholl has pointed out in her excellent little pamphlet on *The Indian Problem*, "negotiations are proceeding for some concessions to Hyderabad in respect of Berar, to Mysore as regards the British Residency and Cantonments. There will also be gradual remission of tributes long paid by various States to the Government, or payment to some for territories ceded at different

times to the British Raj, less the value of privileges now enjoyed in respect of Customs, or the Manufacture of Salt. The total net cost to Federal Revenues of these remissions is estimated at about £ 750,000 per annum. *No State standing out of the Federation will benefit.*" My question is not whether the retrocessions or remissions that are the subject of bargaining, are intrinsically just or desirable or feasible: my question simply is how far it is fair to secure a promise to enter^d into the proposed Federation as condition precedent to any consideration of the bargains under reference. How far is all this evidence of the free and voluntary offer of Indian States to participate in the Federal scheme proposed in the White Paper?

VII. WHITE PAPER BOMBS

UNWELCOME AND PERILOUS GIFTS:—If *not* adhering to any one political philosophy be a mark of genius, if *not* satisfying the majority of those for whom it is intended be virtue in a Constitutional Draft—then certainly the White Paper will be entitled to high praise. For, indeed, almost every school of public opinion in India has, whether in a greater or lesser measure, expressed its disapproval of the White Paper. The Congress has chosen to treat that document as an Untouchable quite. Even the Liberal Federation, whose leaders have

long been the prize-boys of the British Government, has condemned the White Paper recommendations as inadequate, and has, as a body, non-co-operated with the Joint Committee set up to examine those recommendations. The Hindu Mahasabha has protested against the step-motherly treatment accorded by the White Paper to Hindus in several Provinces. Even the vocal Muslims, to placate whom the authors of the White Paper have striven their best—to whom separate Communal electorates have been granted everywhere, as also representation in the Legislatures on a population basis where Muslims are in a majority, and representation far in excess of such basis wherever they are in a minority, and a separate Province for Sind regardless of cost and other considerations—even these are not wholly satisfied, as perhaps they will not be unless they get back Akbar's if not Aurangazeb's days! The leaders of the Depressed Classes who have had not a little greatness thrust upon them by Government, yet feel that the White Paper does not make them whether in wealth or in official emoluments as high as such greatness would covet. The European Association in India is apprehensive about the transfer of Law and Order to elected Indian Ministers in view of the fact that Terrorism up to date has defied the preventive vigilance of the Government. The All-India Landholders com-

plain that the proposed legislatures do not afford adequate protection to their interests. The spokesmen of Indian Commerce, of Indian Industries, of Indian Labour have all their complaints too. Lastly, the All-India Varnashram Swarajya Sangha has pointed out how the White Paper has failed to take sufficient note of India's past history and present conditions, and *has not drafted any scheme of Responsible Government adapted to the manifold diversities of Indian life*. It may be mentioned in passing that the suggestion made in some quarters is quite untrue, that the Sangha stands for any old-world Brahmin supremacy, or other vested interests. The simple truth is that the overwhelming majority of Hindus—whether Caste or Non-Caste, whether Brahmin or Non-Brahmin—are orthodox and conservative; they are as deeply religious as non-political in their every-day life. The White Paper has woefully ignored this fact; wherefore its recommendations unless materially modified and improved so as to guarantee strict Religious Non-interference by modern India's mixed legislatures, will not be acceptable to the Hindu majority. Thus nobody in India is quite pleased with the White Paper, whose net recommendations seek only to give the vote to several millions—to 38 of whom 18 only are literate—who do not at present know how to use it, and to vest all effective political power in the hands of a few middle-class leaders. And

there will be such a keen struggle for this power among individuals and groups that India, for a fairly long time to come, will not be able to dispense with England's strong arm—whether in the management of her external or even her internal affairs. In other words, the White Paper will introduce into India a huge political cock-pit in which Indian leaders will tear one another mercilessly. This is how the White Paper proposes to train Indians for whatever further Responsible Government they may aspire to in the future.

A COSTLY WHITE ELEPHANT:—The root-cause of all this colossal tragedy is that British statesmen of all parties seem to believe that they are *pledged* to introduce Responsible Government into India *on Western lines*. This was made clear in the course of the debate on the White Paper that took place in the House of Commons early in 1933. Thus Sir Samuel Hoare, the Secretary of State for India, declared: "For the best part of a century, rightly or wrongly, we had developed India on Western lines. We had led every responsible man in India to believe Western, particularly British, institutions were suited to India's development." According to Sir John Simon, British statesmen "were pledged as clearly to-day as any country could be in point of honour to develop India on the road to Responsible Government." Mr. Lansbury, the Labour leader, and Mr. Baldwin, the Conservative, were even

stronger in declaring that it was England's duty to give Home Rule to India—of course on the Western pattern, as is attempted in the White Paper—at an early date. Indeed, elsewhere, upon a later day this very question was specifically raised as to the desirability of developing India on Western lines; and Mr. Baldwin, answering it at Manchester, on the 29th June, is reported to have said: "There are many men who say that democratic institutions have failed, and that Parliamentary government is at a discount; and why should we force it on India? We have taught them to follow our example; and how can we turn on them now and say that what we have taught them is false?" But the answer to Mr. Baldwin's question is very simple: if Mr. Baldwin's experiences to-day lead him to discover that his yesterday's god has feet of clay, then he not merely can say, but he *must* say: "We have tried and found it wanting." But this apart, what is going to be the cost of the White Elephant that England will graciously present to India? The Secretary of State has himself placed before the Joint Committee a Memorandum prepared by that veteran Indian officer and administrator, Sir Malcolm Hailey, dealing with the financial implications of the Provincial Autonomy and Federation outlined in the White Paper. The object of the Memorandum "is to afford some guide to the points which may arise in discussion of the finan-

cial implications of the constitutional changes now under consideration." In fact, from his detailed Memorandum, Sir Samuel Hoare himself drew the following conclusions: (1) *Re*: setting up of Provincial Autonomy, "the expenditure involved may be something between 6 and 8 crores." (2) "The expenditure for the Federal structure is a figure of about $2\frac{1}{2}$ crores." (3) "The greater part of this deficit, call it, if you will, from six to ten crores, is due not to the setting up of the Federal Government in the centre, but to the setting up of autonomous provinces upon a self-supporting basis." (4) "If the state of the world does not get better, if we still go on with commodity prices either at their present level or actually falling, not only does it make any change almost impossible but it makes the existing system almost equally impossible." (5) "It is most important to emphasise the fact that, so far as we can see, for quite a number of years to come, there is no orange to divide up in India between the Centre and the Provinces."—Have prices risen since this Memorandum was prepared? Has the state of the world got better or else worse?

PAINTED FEDERAL LEGISLATURE.—Or again, is the While Paper scheme even theoretically free from defects. Dr. Morgan K.C., D.L., an eminent Constitutional lawyer of England, in a series of six Articles contributed to the "Morning Post,"

considers the White Paper's Federal scheme as a tremendous "leap in the dark." He shows how the Scheme introduces "a six-fold division of Legislative authority" which it seeks to integrate by a series of safeguards which are "quite illusory." "The startling thing about the White Paper proposals is that for the first time in its history, Parliament is to be invited to bestow not only legislative authority but Self-Government on a great community, or, rather, a gigantic collection of 'communities,' on the express assumption that it will be abused. Therefore Parliament is to be invited to provide 'safeguards' against such abuse." The learned Doctor goes in fact into a lot of details, and arrives at the conclusion, from the strictly legal and constitutional standpoint, that the White Paper proposes a fantastic structure "unsafe to touch: unsure to stand on!" What answer to Dr. Morgan's technical criticisms the constitutional experts on the Government side have got, the public, as yet, do not know. But laying aside, for a moment, the Constitutional and Financial defects of the White Paper's Federal scheme, what is its general value as a practical means for the establishment of Responsible Government in British India with which it is primarily concerned? According to the White Paper, "the executive power and authority of the Federation will be vested in the King, and will be exercisable

by the Governor-General as his representative, aided and advised by a Council of Ministers responsible to a Legislature containing representatives both of British India and the States. But whereas in the Provinces the Council of Ministers will be entitled . . . to tender advice to the Governor on all matters which fall within the scope of Provincial administration . . . the transfer of Responsibility at the centre will not be co-extensive with the range of the Federal Government's activities." In other words, there will be Dyarchy in the proposed Central Federal Government. Thus (1) "certain Departments, namely, those concerned with Defence, External Affairs, and Ecclesiastical Administration, are to be entrusted to the Governor-General personally; and these matters he will control in responsibility to His Majesty's Government and Parliament," (2) "In the exercise moreover of certain powers to be conferred by the Constitution on the Governor-General and to be expressed as being exerciseable at his discretion, the Governor-General will be entitled to act without seeking advice from his Ministers." Similarly (3), for certain purposes for which the Governor-General "will be charged with a special responsibility," the Governor-General will act as he deems fit! Subject to these reservations, and exceptions, and safeguards, the Central Government will be run by Ministers "responsible" to a Federal legis-

lature consisting of elected members in the main. In the lower Chamber, to be called the House of Assembly, there are to be some 375 members—125 from the States and 250 from British India, from the various Provinces, and on behalf of both general and special interests. 57 seats are allotted to Europeans, Anglo-Indians, Indian Christians, Women, Landholders, Commerce, Industry, and Labour—but *none for Learning or Culture*, Western or Eastern. Of the remaining 193 seats, 82 are for Muslims, 6 for Sikhs, and 105 for Hindus; out of which 105 seats 19 are reserved for “the Scheduled Castes.” The 174 “Hindu,” Muslim, and Sikh non-scheduled members will be elected directly, each by some 40,000 voters on an average; who, on an average again, will be scattered over an area of at least 6,000 square miles; and in order to provide for the “reserved” seats, as some Constituencies will have to be plural-member constituencies, some of the candidates may verily have to canvass over an area of ten to twelve thousand square miles. Will this induce competent candidates to offer for election unless they happen also to be very rich? Obviously the White Paper is against competent men as it is against men of learning and culture wherefore it gives no representation to all the Universities even put together, nor of course for any Religion whether in the Lower or Upper Chamber. British statesmen may not know what high rever-

ence people in India have for learned and holy men ; but how has it happened that the most trusted Indian advisers of the British Government—who resent being described as only nominal Indians—who have insisted on special representation to Commerce, Industry, Capital, and Labour—have in their most Indian recommendations banished all scholarship and learning—which is proverbially indigent—to the upper or lower worlds beyond the Upper and Lower Chambers of Legislation ?

PONDEROUS PROVINCIAL AUTONOMY:—It is unnecessary to deal further with the most representative character of the proposed Central Legislature. Does the White Paper scheme tend to establish real and efficient autonomy in the Provinces at least ? The Congress in India has long complained against the artificial, heterogeneous, unwieldy and lifeless character of existing Provincial areas and administrations, and has demanded the redistribution of Provinces on a linguistic or other rational basis. For example, Bombay has an area of 151,637 square miles—five times that of Scotland, or three times that of England—and is made of four Provinces really, namely, Sind, Guzerat, Maharashtra, and Karnatak, differing very widely in physical features and climate, and in the languages, and economic and social life of the peoples. Only Sind—and that to meet the wishes of certain All-India Muslim learders—is going to be divided

from the rest of Bombay; how do the rest form one homogeneous whole? In Madras, with an area again of nearly three times that of England, with a population of 47 millions speaking at least five different languages, the physical, climatic, and economic diversities are quite appalling. How can an Educational or Agricultural or Health Minister hailing as Sir A. P. Patro once did, from one of the northernmost Telugu Districts, be humanly expected to be in personal touch with the educational or agricultural or sanitary requirements of a Tamil District or a Malayalam District 1,000 or 1,200 miles away from his home? The Central Provinces, again, with an area of 121,191 square miles—two and a half times that of England—is made up of two distinct parts, Marathi and Hindi. The "U.P." was, till 80 or 100 years back, made of four, if not five, separate States. Similarly every major Province in British India is a huge, artificial, wooden, "antediluvian" anomaly. And yet among the many delegates to the R.T.C.s, who thundered eloquently about immediate and full Provincial Autonomy, and Central Responsibility and All-India Federation, even among the great Congress leaders who attended the second R.T.C., how was it that none pressed for a general re-distribution of the existing unwieldy, anomalous Provinces into less unwieldy and more uniform ones? Yes, the White Paper Scheme keeps up in the main the

existing Provincial areas, and only provides (1) for an *unsolicited* lowering of the franchise, (2) for a *mere numerical increase* in the strength of Provincial Legislatures, and (3) for a *mere mechanical substitution* in place of the present combination of Ministers and Executive Councillors of a team solely of Ministers—without any change in the unwieldy red-tapism of the Departments under each. How can this mere change in the personnel of the machine-drivers lead to any real Provincial Autonomy? Such change can only lead to deterioration in the efficiency of administration, and to increase in its cost which must fall on the heads of the poor people at large.

PALSIED RELIGIOUS NEUTRALITY.—If thus the White Paper scheme is exposed to Constitutional risks on one side, to Financial obstacles on another, to the indecision of Princes on the third, to the Unreality of Responsibility introduced on the fourth, what is the net value of the political talisman that the White Paper has been dangling before all India and England all these two years? Does the White Paper propose at least to reproduce in statutory form the relevant clauses of what three generations of Indians have come to regard as their Magna Carta, namely, the Queen's Proclamation, which declared equal opportunities to all, irrespective of race or creed, and enjoined strict Religious Neutrality on "all those who may be in authority"

under the Queen, on pain of her "highest displeasure"? Do the authors of the White Paper know that whatever the very small though vocal minority of English-educated, denationalised Indians may say or feel, the vast majority of Indians—whether Hindu or Muslim—are deeply religious by nature? that they resent the interferences in religious rites, sacraments, and institutions which oftentimes Britishers in India, in order to placate a handful of rebels against religious restraints, help to get sanctioned by law? Yes; the majority in India want that strict Religious Non-interference should be a fundamental provision of the new Constitution. They claim it on the very strong ground that the Indian Legislature can make no laws "affecting the authority of Parliament" or "any part of *the unwritten laws* . . . whereon may depend the allegiance of any person to the Crown." It is sad that the learned President of the Legislative Assembly recently gave a ruling inconsistent with the implications of this provision *re* "*unwritten laws*;" for the right to religious freedom and right to property are an essential part of these "*unwritten laws*," as declared in 29 *Madras 1085, P. C.* Under the existing Constitution no measure or Bill affecting the religion of any community can be introduced in any Indian Legislature without the "previous sanction" of the Governor-General. But how can a British statesman who

becomes Governor-General know how far a proposed measure is against the fundamentals of any religion in India? Will he not be guided by the vocal heterodox Reformers mainly,—of the Sapru-Patro-Jayakar variety? Wherefore, the orthodox majority demand that something like the following provision should be inserted in the new Constitution, namely:—

“It shall not be lawful to introduce in any Indian legislature any measure, or Bill which affects or tends to affect the religious beliefs or religious rites and usages or institutions of any community in British India without the previous sanction of the Governor-General *who shall consult the recognised religious heads and organisations of the Community or Communities sought to be affected before giving his sanction*; and no such measure shall be deemed to have been passed except on the vote of not less than two-thirds of the representatives in the Legislature belonging to Community or Communities sought to be affected.

BOONS OR BOMBS?:—“If to-day”, cried prophetically the great C. R. Das in December 1922, “the British Parliament grants Provincial Autonomy in the Provinces with Responsibility in the Centre, I, for one, will unhesitatingly protest against it. For it will inevitably lead to the concentration of power in the hands of the middle class. I do not believe that the middle class will then part with their

power. *How will it profit India if in place of the white bureaucracy that now rules over her, there is substituted an Indian bureaucracy of the middle class?*" The staunchest supporter of the White Paper must admit that it seeks to introduce nothing more than "Provincial Autonomy in the Provinces with Responsibility in the Centre"; nothing more than the substitution, in place of the present white or mixed bureaucracy, of a purely Indian bureaucracy of the middle class which may be more tyrannical over the masses, and possibly less efficient. If such be the fruits in store for us from the White Paper recommendations, how shall any impartial critic characterise them? as gracious and sane boons granted to people who prize them? or else as gratuitous bombs hurled recklessly at India's innocent millions?

2900

W. J. 24

VIII. DEMOCRACY: NOMINAL AND REAL

POST-WAR DICTATORSHIPS:—Democracy, as ordinarily conceived in the West, is in the melting pot. Historically speaking, France was the first country in modern Europe to overthrow Monarchy, and declare itself a Republic; but to-day, not Liberty, Fraternity, or Equality but violent chaos reigns in France. The course of the Republic proclaimed in Spain at the end of 1931 has been more violent and chaotic. The Soviet that now rules in

place of old Czardom in Russia is even more efficiently despotic ; indeed its emissaries are alleged to carry the red flag wherever there is trouble brewing under the sun. In the United States, where the flag of Freedom flies perhaps more ostentatiously than anywhere else, President Roosevelt's word seems to have become as irresistible as the almighty dollar. And yet the Marquess of Lothian, in a recent article in the *Spectator*, contends—though with more show than substance—that democracy as such has not failed ; but that conditions have arisen “ which are causing difficulties to all forms of Government democratic, autocratic, or otherwise ”. According to him “ the real cause of the trials which confront all forms of government is, in the main, international anarchy—anarchy in a world which has enormously contracted in terms of time and space ”. But whence has this “ anarchy ” sprung that threatens all forms of Government ? Is such anarchy a compliment to the scientific “ civilisation ” of the modern world ? Indeed Lord Lothian's own admissions are enough to secure a verdict against him. Now, according to the learned Marquess, “ the essence of democracy . . . is . . . two things ”—(1) “ freedom of speech and criticism, and political and economic initiative for the individual ” ; and (2) that “ government should be changeable without violence, at the ultimate decision of an adult electorate.” And he emphasises

that "the post-War dictatorships have a popular foundation. . . . They all claim to rest on an adult majority vote, though"—alas, and alas! for Lord Lothian's logic—"that majority is obtained by ruthless violence against their opponents and by complete control of all opinion-forming agencies". How can any majority obtained by such methods, apart from what repugnance Lord Lothian might feel for them, square with his two essentials of democracy, namely, free criticism and free vote?

OLD DEMOCRACY OF NUMBERS:—In theory all politicians, not alone Lord Lothian, will say that they are for quite a free majority vote. But in practice it is to the numerical majority that importance is attached, not to the manner in which it is got. Coercion and undue influence, if not bribery, are charges often hurled by each party against its opponents in contested elections; though the charges are as often difficult of proof except where they are of abnormal dimensions. It is the weight of numbers that count with all advocates of low universal franchise. They ignore the fact that ninety-nine per cent of people in all countries possess neither the knowledge nor the patience to scrutinise the relative merits of diverse appeals to them; that the majority are always more swayed by passions than by reason. Shakespeare describes beautifully how the same crowd of Roman

citizens that hail the "noble Brutus", and are for giving him a statue with his ancestors, in less than an hour, on hearing Antony, rush madly against Brutus and his comrades, shouting "fire, burn, kill, slay; let not a traitor live"! This is the mentality of the masses *at all times*: they are carried off their feet by stirring orations or sensational news-lines. The "universal literacy" and cheap journalism of modern nations have intensified not mitigated the evil. It is thus that the majority at every election vote not through calm discrimination but in response to catching slogans. Lord Lothian expresses repugnance to a majority got through "control of opinion-forming agencies"; does his repugnance extend to majorities got through exciting catch-words? Lastly, as possession is nine points of the law, so success is nine points of politics in the modern world. That is how Mussuloni and Hitler, Devalera and Roosevelt are popular, at least for the time being. That is perhaps how their governments "rest on a popular foundation". In other words it is inevitable that in any democracy of numbers attention should concentrate more on the *fact* of a majority, than on the *manner* of it. Does not this criticism apply to the British Parliamentary system also, wherein the latest evolution of a Coalition in place of Party Government shows the efficacy of a numerical majority however obtained. And yet, what fate has overtaken the Capitalism

and Industrialism of the nineteenth century must soon overtake its Democracy also.

PASSING OF THE OLD ORDER :—The rise of Dictatorships in very many modern countries is only one indication of the inherent weakness of the Democracy of Numbers. These political developments like the Slump in international trade that confronts modern nations, must lead serious thinkers everywhere to re-examine the value of not only the political and economic but also of the social and educational institutions that obtain at present. Indeed there have already been a few independent thinkers who feel that "representative government, party organisation, majority rule, with all their excrescences are dead wood. In their stead must appear the organisation of non-partisan groups for the begetting, the bringing into being, of common ideas, a common purpose, and the collective will." According to this school of thought there has been no true democracy at all in the modern world, except to some extent perhaps in the mountainous Cantons of Switzerland. Wherefore the very question whether Democracy has succeeded or has failed is irrelevant; true, real, living democracy has not yet come into existence. And before true democracy can have its birth, the modern man must free himself from the imposing thralldom of machinery whether in industrial and social, or in educational

and cultural spheres. The general trend of European thought has not yet come to perceive the ideal of this New Democracy. But the present problems which are agitating Europe offer no other solution. This is practically what Miss M. P. Follett, the talented American authoress of *The New State* more than a decade ago pointed out in her fascinating book. This likewise is the general theme of Mr. Wellock's *Spiritual Basis of Democracy*. Both forcibly contend that the material civilisation of the modern world has crushed the individual, the higher self in man; that modern materialistic environments prevent the development of the individual, his full expansion, his realisation of the golden Unity that links him with all that exists, as Indian philosophy has declared. But the shackles that bind man are all bound to fall—sooner or later.

NEW DEMOCRACY BASED ON GROUP ORGANISATION:—
“Up to the present moment,” says the gifted authoress of *The New State* “we have never seen the individual yet. The search for him has been the whole long striving of our Anglo-Saxon history. We sought him through the method of representation and failed to find him. We sought to reach him by extending the suffrage to every man, and then to every woman, and yet he eludes us. Direct government now seeks the individual”. Again, “majority rule rests on numbers; democracy rests on

the well-grounded assumption that society is not a collection of units but a network of human relations. Democracy is not worked at the polling booths ; it is the bringing forth of a genuine collective will, one to which every single human being must contribute the whole of his complex life, as one which every single being must express the whole of at one point. Thus the essence of democracy is creating. The technique of democracy is group-organisation". This school of thought holds—and may it soon become the common conception of all peoples!—that from the individual to the "Unified State" it is one continuous process of real and natural growth. Sovereignty (Swaraj) is a relative notion. The individual is sovereign over himself—can attain his Swaraj—"in so far as he can develop, control, unify his manifold nature." From the individual we come to "the integrated neighbourhood," which is the real foundation of the unified state, which again in its turn gives us the true ideal of the world-state. "This integrated neighbourhood is a great deal more than the mere physical contiguity of the people who live in the neighbourhood area. It requires the evolution of what has been called neighbourhood consciousness." In other words, the question is: "how can the force generated by the neighbourhood life become part of our whole civic and natural life?" By the generation of the

collective will, is the answer. "The democracy which obtains today rests on an attempt at securing the common will by a process of addition. This really means a war of wills, the issue being left to be decided by a mere superiority of numbers. New democracy discountenances this process of addition, and insists on the discovery of detailed means and methods by which the different wills of a neighbourhood entity may grow into one common collective will. This process is not a process of addition but of integration, and the consciousness of the neighbourhood thus awakened must express the common collective will of that neighbourhood entity. The collective wills of the several neighbourhood centres must by a similar process of integration be allowed to evolve the common collective will of the whole nation. It is only thus, by a similar process of integration that any League of Nations may be real, and the vision of a world State or Federation may be realised." That is how Miss Follett declares, and rightly declares: "*Thus group organisation releases us from the domination of mere numbers, thus democracy transcends time and space. It can never be understood except as a spiritual force.*" The development of the higher Self dormant in each individual, the development of the neighbourhood consciousness and of the collective will in each local area—this is the foundation upon which New Democracy seeks

to be built. How closely akin is this ideal to the Indian ideal of *Swaraj*?

IX. THE SWARAJ GOAL

WHAT IS SWARAJ?—For some thirty years now Indian politicians have been putting forth a demand for “Swaraj”. Few of them perhaps have had any deep conception of it, though all doubtless have implied by it some kind of Self-Government or Home Rule. It was Dadabhai Naoroji, I think, who, as President of the Bombay Congress of 1904, first made the formal demand for “Swaraj”. Some fifteen years later the Congress adopted as its creed “the attainment of Swaraj by India by all peaceful and legitimate means”; but up to date the Congress has not defined the term, nor given any outline of the *Swaraj* it wants. In 1921, at the inauguration of the new Legislatures in India under the Act of 1919, His Imperial Majesty, King George, through H. R. H. the venerable Duke of Connaught, sent the following gracious message to the peoples of India: “For years—it may be for generations—patriotic and loyal Indians have dreamed of Swaraj for their motherland. Today you have the beginnings of Swaraj within my Empire, and the widest scope and ample opportunity for progress to the political liberty which my other Dominions enjoy”. Thus Swaraj has come

to be used vaguely both by Europeans and Indians as almost a synonym for "Dominion Status". This however limits the significance of *Swaraj* unduly. Etymologically, *Swaraj*—which is a popular contraction of the word *Swarajya*—is made up of the two Sanskrit words, *Swa* and *raj* or *rajya*, and means literally Self-rule or Self-sovereignty. But what is meant by "self" and what by "sovereignty"? Quite a volume can be written about the Indian philosophy of the Self and of its relation to the Non-self; but that will be beyond the scope of a book like the present. At the same time, the term *Swaraj* cannot be fully explained without a reference, however brief, to the Indian doctrine of the Self which teaches that every human being is essentially a soul or spirit with a body or bodies. In the English language—and possibly in other European languages as well—we find words like somebody, everybody, nobody used with reference to a human being; which shows that the people who speak those languages think of man as a body endowed, at best, with a soul. The Indian idiom on the other hand—and are not all idioms an index to the peoples' psychology?—is quite different: *jivatma* is the most common Indian word for a living being; while a great man is called a *Mahatma*, and a bad man a *duratma*, and so on; which shows that the Indian thinks of man as essentially an *atma*, or soul,

endowed with one or more bodies. Indeed Indian philosophers of all schools hold that everything in the Universe, including man, is a compound of Purusha and Prakriti or Spirit and Matter; that the spirit is eternal and unchanging, while Matter is the root-cause of all the diversities and inequalities in the phenomenal world. In man Matter manifests not only as the bodily and sense-organs but also as the mind and higher faculties of self-realisation; while the spirit abides deep, as it were, within the bodily and mental encasements, struggling every moment to free itself from their bondage. And countless human beings in various stages of development have to live and move and work together, until each one, in his own time, transcends the limitations of Matter, and realises his spiritual Unity with all that exists, and so attains Swaraj or Self-sovereignty.

EVOLUTION OF THE SELF:—Again all Hindu schools of thought accept the Sankhya analysis that Prakriti (Matter) manifests itself in the following twenty-four *vikritis* or varieties. They are the five *bhutas* (which word means compounds not elements as often wrongly translated) of earth, water, fire, air, and space; their five *tanmatras* of odour, taste, form, touch, and sound; the five active organs of motion, work, alimentation, excretion, and reproduction; the five sense-organs of smell, taste, sight, touch, and sound; *manas* or the feeling, thinking,

lower mind is the twenty-first category; *buddhi*, the discriminating, "pure reason" is the twenty-second; above which are *mahat* and *ahamkara*, from which spring all individuality and I-ness. Purusha, Spirit or Soul, is the twenty-fifth *tattwa* or category of the Sankhya analysis; *It* is deathless and, in itself, eternally blissful. In a general way, we may say that man's active and sense organs and *manas* or thinking mind form his *lower* Self; while *buddhi* or discriminating mind, and the rest constitute his *higher* Self. This ultimate analysis does not imply that all individuals are in the same stage of development; the higher self in most is still latent. That is how we read in the Bhagavad-Gita:

Their diverse senses men regard as high;
 The thinking *manas* is higher; higher still
 Is discriminating *buddhi*; than which doth lie
 Far higher *he* whom nought can maim or kill.

And the problem of social and political organisation is, or ought to be, how to devise an order that will help the evolution of the higher self among the countless individuals that make up the body politic. Western "scientific" thought has not yet popularised man's higher self; it is still obsessed with the lower, materialistic world; all its endeavour has been to get "conquest" over external Nature, and utilise that conquest for insatiate sense-gratification. From this verily has developed the

economic and political chaos which threatens to wreck modern society. The root-cause of such chaos lies—though, stray exceptions apart, Western “experts” do not yet see it—in the militant race for sense-enjoyment among individuals, and groups, and nations alike. How vividly from of old hath this peril been impressed upon the Indian mind? Thus, in the Bhagavad-Gita, for instance, it is pointed out

When on sense-objects broods the mind,
Attached to them it soon doth find ;
From sense-attachment grows desire,
And soon from it flow passions dire ;
Delusion follows ; memory fails ;
Which loss of *buddhi* soon entails ;
From loss of *buddhi* perisheth man—
Self-wrecked within one mortal span !

INDIVIDUAL SWARAJ:—Wherefore, in India, the practical question before all aspirants after higher life has been how to get control over the senses and the mind which in the average man are so restless. “Is it not as hard to control the mind as it is to control the air?” asks Arjuna in the Bhagavad-Gita ; and the Lord Sri Krishna answers him :

“No doubt, Oh strong-armed one ! the mind
Is restless quite and unrestrained ;
But through dispassion, and practice hard
Control o’er it is slowly gained.”

This has been demonstrated in the lives of very many men and women in the past; some indeed have lived in every generation, who through hard practice and dispassion had subdued their lower selves, and evolved their higher nature; some who verily had attained self-realisation and become God-seers. They have lived in unbroken continuity from time immemorial down to the present day. In recent times, to give only a few examples, Sri Ramakrishna in Bengal (1836 to 1886) became a Paramahansa or God-seer in a wonderful way: he was not a learned man in any sense; yet through sheer "madness" he realised God alike through Hinduism, and through Christianity, and through Islam. He chose as his chief disciple an English-educated Bengali youth who started life as a downright agnostic. This youth developed into the mighty Swami Vivekananda, who attended the Chicago Parliament of Religions in 1893; and whose deep learning, passionate eloquence and inspiring personality impressed strikingly on all who came into contact with him whether in the East or in the West. Swami Rama Tirtha was another English-educated Indian—he was an M.A., and Professor in a first-grade College for some time—who had his eyes opened by a Master, and who roamed blissfully "*In the Woods of God-Realisation*". Col. Yeats-Brown in his *Bengal Lancer* tells us how less than fifteen years ago he came to

meet an English knowing seer, a "Bhagavan Sri", who knew the path to the "Temple of the Undistracted Mind". I too had the privilege for many years of being in touch with a great soul, a Non-Brahmin by birth but a Brahmin of Brahmins in spiritual development, who knew just a little of English, and even less of Sanskrit; but who knew how to rouse the higher self in those who truly aspired for it. I have no doubt that there are some God-seers in India at this very hour, though the "super-showman" known as Mahatma Gandhi is not one of them, who silently go about ministering unto all earnest souls. Indeed the Hindu conception of higher life deserves universal homage for the following two reasons: (1) It holds that spiritual Truth, God's existence, is not a mere matter of faith, but a matter capable of *direct realisation*, however hard the path may be in the initial stages that leads to it. The pious Christian invokes Jesus as

"Strong Son of God, immortal Love,
Whom we, that have not seen Thy face,
Through faith and faith alone embrace,
Believing where we cannot prove!"

But in India spiritual aspirants want to feel God, to see God, to be immersed in the Bliss of God-realisation, whether through the path of "Knowledge" or of "Action" or of "Love". (2) It teaches that

through diverse paths, each suited to the aspirant's past line of development, under diverse names and forms, the same goal is reached that transcends all thought and word. "Only through our father Abraham" or only "through Jesus", or "only through Mohammed" are cries foreign to India's genius. Indeed the religious Hindu reminds himself each time that he says his prayers,

As showers of rain do all to the ocean speed,
All forms of worship, so, to Kesav lead !

GROUP SWARAJ:—Thus the path that leads to individual Swaraj has long been known to the qualified few in India; and it is honoured and prized by all except those who have fallen victims to the beastly glamour of Western materialism. The problem of Group Swaraj is far harder; because the individuals composing any group are not all, in actual life, of the same mental, or moral, or spiritual development. *In essence* each soul is no doubt a ray of the highest, holiest One; and of each the supreme Blissful One is the final goal. But *in the phenomenal* world, which is the training ground for all, diversity, inequality, complexity, and struggle—these mark the course of both inner and outer evolution, till the goal is reached. Group Swaraj, in other words, will be possible only where there are groups organised on right lines, on lines that will help the all-round development of the

individuals that compose each group. Such group-organisation can be devised only by leaders well versed in the Science and Art of Higher Life, by experts who know the full implications of the supreme law of Unity in Diversity, who know how to integrate individuals into smaller or larger groups as may be necessary without impairing their individuality, who know above all how to inspire individuals with devotion to higher ideals amidst the lowliest of worldly avocations. Widespread devotion to higher ideals of life is the very essence of Cultural Swaraj; and this ought to be the basis of every other kind of Swaraj—economic, political, social—that can benefit both individuals and communities, and that can serve the higher interests of human progress which cannot be placed in water-tight compartments.

X. THE PATH OF DHARMIC EVOLUTION

A MAD RUSH:—What is called “civilisation” is of haphazard origin, though its growth has been rapid. Most of its discoveries were accidental; their application neither far-sighted nor well-controlled. In the first flush of the unexpected and large powers which scientific machinery promised to place at their disposal, few men perhaps were in a mood to question the real value of those powers, or the full implications of the machinery required

for them. "The makers of modern Civilisation" are claimed to have been all practical men, not dreamy philosophers; they were not concerned with speculations about the origin and purpose of man's life on earth, or its goal; they simply sought to help man in his struggle to get what he wanted from the outside world; they aimed simply at adding to the amenities of daily life and work. Evidently these "amenities" were believed to be an end in themselves. So under the delusion of increasing his physical powers, the modern man has become a slave to machinery; and under the delusion of satisfying his wants he has augmented them inordinately. Likewise under plea of effective organisation, men and women have been gathered into innumerable groups and camps, each claiming its "Rights", and therefore each one at war perpetually with all the rest. Thus have arisen the conflicts between landlords and tenants, between Capital and Labour, between one industry or interest and another, between country and country, between white men and coloured, and indeed between the two sexes in no few modern countries. It was the Great War of 1914 that revealed the unpleasant truth to modern nations that "the power of Science to kill was to its power to cure as twenty to one". It was the world Economic Depression of 1929 that forced very many to perceive the perils of excessive industrialism, of

"unplanned capitalism", of "economic nationalism", and so on. It is likewise the growing World-Slump of the day that is awakening very many experts to a sense of the "international anarchy" that is fast leading, they think, to world-chaos. And not a few "experts"—all practical men, of course—are now for replacing militant individualism and nationalism by some form of militant world-control or socialism. Because handfuls of sea-water have not quenched the feverish thirst, they will fain pump the same salt water with the most powerful engines available!

A GIANT VANQUISHED BY A DWARF:—But be the future what it may, the rush of civilisation so far has been most intrepid. Its glamour has spread from the West to many countries in the East. Modern Egypt and Turkey, Persia and Afghanistan, have all got fast modernised. Japan in the Far East, during a single generation, has quite outstripped her Western masters in the race. But what about India? It is true that for the past one hundred years and more both British administrators and Indian reformers have been making strenuous attempts to modernise India economically, politically, socially, culturally. Thousands of "educated" Indians have thus become westernised in thought and ideals. The masses in India, however, have clung to their ancient traditions with a tenacity that has provoked surprise, dis-

appointment, anger, in many quarters ; but into the real cause of which only a " Bengal Lancer " could probe aright. The simple fact is that India's latent genius takes things far more seriously than at their face value ; her millions may gape with wonder at a motor car or a gramophone or an aeroplane ; but their heart's adoration is for the loin-clad seeker after spiritual Bliss. And so we find repeated on earth today the old story of the giant Bali and the dwarf Vamana. As of old, so now all the conquests of the lower man over earth and air fail to come up to three foot-paces of spiritual measure. But how do the illiterate millions in India manage to keep indifferent to all the full blaze of worldly science, or all the deep charm of worldly power ?

AN ANCIENT INHERITANCE :—The answer lies deep writ in every page of the real story of India through the ages ; not of course in her ancient history as " reconstructed " by Indologists and crammed into the heads of unsuspecting boys and girls in schools and colleges. The answer is to be found in the fact that from time immemorial the masses in India have been taught, more by example than by precept, to regard life on earth as but a short stage in a long journey wherein worldly riches and power would be of far less utility than sense-control. That is how they have come to pay more respect to the loin-clad aspirant after spiritual life than to kings

and warriors or to merchant-princes and millionaires; that is how they have come to cherish the memories not of great conquerors, of those who built huge cities and palaces, but of those who struggled to see God, of those who built temples to commemorate the triumphs of God-love, of those who endowed choultries or feeding-houses for wandering *sadhus*. This reverence for higher life has come to be interwoven in the every-day language of the people; it thrills in the blood of every Hindu boy or girl that listens with rapture to the tales of men and women who became God-lovers, and God-seers. And there is not a single district or sub-district in India today where there are not traditions about these great souls; not a single district without some ancient temple whose annual festivals attract thousands from far and near. Lastly there has not been one single generation in India without some God-seers who have roamed over the length and breadth of the land, showing the higher path to the qualified few, and inspiring among people at large devotion to the higher ideals of life, devotion above all to the supreme path of Dharma or Duty in every-day life, by treading which one and all can sooner or later reach safely the highest goal of life.

THE RELIGION OF DHARMA:—Yes; countless saints and seers have familiarised India's masses at large with the fundamentals of the religion of

Dharma. Its truths were discovered and taught by seers who were well aware of the Unity of the highest existence, and the Diversity of phenomenal life; who knew the complexity of man's nature and environment, and the perpetual struggle between the lower and the higher cravings in life; who knew that until the final goal is reached there is, and can be no real equality among all human beings, and therefore no one straight path or simple rule for all. The chief ideas involved in the Religion of Dharma—and by Dharma is meant the sum-total of the activities necessary for the well-being of both the individual and society at large at each stage—may be stated as follows: (1) In the struggle between man's higher self and lower cravings, every individual is born many times on earth, getting his physical body from parents with whom he has contracted old affinities, but carrying with him in a latent form his mental and moral powers and tendencies from one life-stage to another. (2) Such of the latent powers and tendencies as are ripe for development in any particular life-period, together known as *Prarabdha-Karma*, or activeness that has begun to manifest, dominate during that particular life. (3) Thus working out his *prarabdha*, and at the same time building his future, every individual functions in an environment with which he has sown affinities in past lives—although his present, limited, pheno-

menal mind does not remember them. (4) And so each individual advances from one life-stage to another, evolving more and more of his higher self, until at long last he realises his immortality. That is how the Lord Sri Krishna declared to Arjuna :

“ At the end of very many births

He reaches Me who hath come to know
That Vasudeva is All :

Such great soul is hard to find below.”

(5) It is by treading the path of “ Swadharma ” at each stage that the individual gradually releases himself from the bonds of the phenomenal world, that he comes to realise that “ Vasudeva is All ”; by Swadharma being meant the *Duty* of the individual at each stage, his doing everything in life as action *due* from him for the orderly progress of himself and of the world at large. (6) Therefore Swadharma varies from individual to individual, and from group to group, being determined in its details by the place occupied by each individual in the group, and by each group in the body social. Swadharma, thus, seeks to integrate the individuals constituting each group, and the groups making up society at large. India's law-givers knew well and declared unequivocally that not Right but Duty should be the watchword of every man or woman, and of every community, that aspires to orderly

progress on earth, and to realisation in due course of the ultimate goal of life. They knew well, that the mentality that is obsessed with "Rights"—e.g. the "Rights of Man", "Rights of Woman", "Rights of Labour" and so on—is *asuric*, beastly; that it can only lead to strife and retrogression among both individuals and groups. The religion of Dharma, the mentality fostered by it, helps to the triumph of the higher self over the lower; it emphasises at every step the indissoluble link between man and his environment, or between the individual self and the group self. The idea of the group self starts with the family, and expands gradually to the community, the state, and humanity at large, and finally to all that exists. Swadharma, thus, is the duty of the limited self to the unlimited self of which it is a part; it is Duty which will help the ever-expanding Self to live and grow physically, mentally, morally, and spiritually. It is thus we get various kinds of Dharma or functional Activity, such as of bodily service, production and distribution of necessary commodities, regulation and control of group-life, its education—all necessary for the weal and growth of society in any specific area. Specialisation in these essential activities, and their harmonious integration gave rise to the *chaturvarnya* or four-fold order of society, the four-fold caste-system whose rationale was long understood and cherished in India, though

of late misunderstood and maligned by minds obsessed with the superficial Equality and Democracy of the modern world. But what, now, will save modern nations from the chaos that confronts them all : the wrangling for Rights or the religion of Dharma ?

XI. DHARMA IN INDIVIDUAL AND GROUP LIFE

DHARMA AS ORGANIC FUNCTIONING:—In themselves most actions are indifferent ; there is nothing intrinsically high or low in them. It is from the relation subsisting between the individual self and the group self or society at large that Dharma or right conduct is determined. It rests on the deep-rooted assumption that in every well-organised group, each individual should contribute his due share to the well-being and development of the group—of the family, or community, of the nation or all humanity as the case may be. In an ancient Vedic hymn organised society is compared to a human body : the learners and teachers are its face ; the soldiers and rulers are its hands ; the craftsmen and traders are the thighs ; the manual workers are the feet. What would happen if any one organ in the body, or any one set of functionaries in society desired to do the work of some other organ or functionaries as the case be ? This

hymn is often interpreted as showing that the four-fold caste system rests on the principle of division of labour. According to Sri Krishna the system is based on "division of Guna and Karma", on the allotment of functions adapted to the aptitudes and character of the functionaries. Speaking generally the hereditary performance of certain functions would help, in a general way, the growth of hereditary aptitudes—in view especially of the forces that unseen determine the individual's re-incarnation or birth amidst a particular environment; and these hereditary aptitudes would help to group-efficiency in no small measure. That is how the religion of ancient India enjoined on every individual the performance of his Swadharma as determined generally by his birth and environment. The modern world in its ignorance of the higher self in man, and of the laws of Karma and Re-incarnation that govern the evolution of the higher self in the phenomenal universe, in its indifference to the right relations that should subsist between the individual and his environment at each stage, may laugh at this religion of Dharma; and it may cheaply talk of Equality and Freedom—and this in a world where all life from the cradle to the grave is amidst growing fetters both of body and of mind; where there is no action however tiny that does not affect others for good or evil. But the laws of life are inexorable; and the modern

world will doubtless learn at terrible cost the consequences of both its ignorance and its indifference. The people of Hindu India, on the whole, have been saved from such peril by the fact that from time immemorial they have been born and bred in an atmosphere saturated with higher ideals of life. This is how the literate and the illiterate alike in India have, speaking generally, displayed strong devotion to Dharma in every-day life.

DHARMIC GROUP ORGANISATION:—Yes ; from time immemorial the social and political institutions of the Hindus—whose basic foundations remain to this day—were so devised as to help people to grow up in their Dharmic traditions. It is impossible to determine—and this despite the pretentious theories of so-called Indologists, whether of the older Philological or the later Epigraphical school—at what time even approximately orderly society and government were established in India. As far back as we can trace, we find evidences of the four-fold social order, and of several kingdoms—their traditional number being fifty-six—whose rulers were charged with the specific duty of preserving the stability of this social order. Yes ; the States of Ancient India were all constituted on the same model ; and had practically the same ideals of government placed before them. The Raja or King was the supreme political head of each state ; his title was generally hereditary ; his duty, as

indicated by the very etymological meaning of word *Raja*, was so to rule as to give satisfaction to his people. He was assisted in the administration by a number of Ministers who also, speaking generally, held their offices hereditarily. Neither the King nor his Ministers were law-makers in Ancient India; they were only the guardians of Law or Dharma, its administrators, they too being as much subject to the Law as the ordinary people. If any Minister gave counsel to the King which was against Dharmic ideals, the people could demand his dismissal; indeed, in exceptional cases where the King himself violated Dharma beyond measure of rectification, it was within the right of the subjects to dethrone him or even to slay him. But speaking generally, as it was the duty of the King to govern according to Dharma, so it was the duty of the subjects to render him true loyalty and obedience. It was part of the duty of the King and of his officers, to come into close personal contact with the people, to listen to their grievances and to try and redress them, even in cases where the complaints were against the King or some of his officers. All this was possible because in Ancient India each state was generally of limited area: or, where very big, it would be divided into principalities, and placed in charge of princes and other nobles. Neither the King nor his nobles nor his officers could interfere in the established

toms of the people, or their avocations and trades and pursuits in life which were regulated by those customs. Of these usages and customs the elders and leaders of the various communities were the guardians and interpreters where any doubts arose. Lastly, the bulk of the people in Ancient India, as in modern, lived in the villages; and each village was organised on quite efficient lines, socially, economically, administratively. Each village was a complete unit, owning all its property in common, and trying to advance the welfare of every family and community within the village area. The affairs of each village were administered by its *Panchayat*, or Council of Five, whose members, if not formally elected, were certainly drawn from the elders in the component communities, and were accepted and honoured as leaders by the villagers at large. The Village Panchayat was in charge of all the village properties; it collected and paid to the King's officers a certain portion, generally one sixth of the agricultural or other income of the villagers; it settled all disputes among the villagers, punished crimes within the village area, looked after village irrigation and tanks and wells, encouraged village crafts, and administered village temples and charities and fairs and festivals. In fact each village was a little Republic, to whose efficiency and resourcefulness and vitality British rulers like Sir Thomas Munro

and Elphinstone bore eloquent testimony in their days. The villages, again, were practically independent of any undue influence from outside ; that was how the bulk of India's people have progressed silently and steadily during millenniums without being seriously affected by wars or political struggles that sometimes swept off big cities and states. Indeed dynasties of kings rose and fell, cities appeared and disappeared ; but the villages continued to flourish, and its inhabitants went on pursuing their hereditary occupations, and trying to pursue the higher ideals of life. Much the same thing happened during the Mohammedan period ; new states and principalities were carved out of the old ones, with an imperial overlord at Delhi ; but the village organisations were left undisturbed. Yes ; towns rose and fell ; states changed in boundaries and in personnel of rulers ; even the imperial overlordship varied in extent and power from time to time ; but the villages progressed for thousands of years undisturbed on the whole, until their autonomy was destroyed by the iron hand of the John Company. With the destruction of the old village organisation dates the decline of Dharmic ideals in modern India.

AN UNQUESTIONABLE TESTIMONY :—Especially among the women of India—the mothers of each generation—this devotion to Dharmic ideals came to be rooted very deep indeed. The average

Hindu woman has been a model of self-control and self-abnegation through the ages. The ideal of chastity which the average Hindu wife lived up to, which led her to completely identify herself with her husband, was frequently demonstrated in the practice of "Sati"—which later degenerated into "Suttee", and came to be branded as the forcible burning of widows by the cheap reformers of modern India. Here is an account of the "last Suttee in Bengal" taken from Buckland's "Bengal under the Lieutenant Governors" and given as narrated by Sir Frederick Halday, first Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal; which will show of what stuff Indian womanhood, at least till recently, was made :

"Suttee was prohibited by law in 1829. At and before that time I was acting as Magistrate of the district of Hooghly. Before the new law came into operation, notice was one day brought to me that a Suttee was about to occur within a few miles from my residence. When the message reached me, Dr. Wise of the Medical Service, and a chaplain (whose name I forget), were visiting me, and expressed a wish to witness the ceremony. Accordingly we drove to the place where a large crowd of natives was assembled at the river bank and the funeral pile already prepared. Chairs were brought for us and we sat down near the woman. My companions, who could not speak in Bengali language, then began to press the widow with all

the reasons they could urge to dissuade her from her purpose, all of which at their request I made the woman understand in her own language. To this she listened with grave and respectful attention, but without being at all moved by it, the priests and many of the spectators also listening to what was said. At length she showed some impatience and asked to be allowed to proceed to the pile. Seeing that nothing further could be done, I gave her the permission; but before she had moved, the clergyman begged me to put to her one more question: 'Did she know what pain she was about to suffer?' She, seated on the ground close to my feet, looked up at me with a scornful expression in her intelligent face, and said for answer, 'Bring me a lamp.' The lamp was brought, of the small sauce-boat fashion used by the peasants, also some *ghi* or melted butter, and a large cotton wick. These she herself arranged in the most effective form, and then said 'Light it'; which was done, and the lamp placed on the ground before her. Then steadfastly looking at me with an air of grave defiance, she rested her elbow on the ground and put her finger into the flame of the lamp. The finger scorched, blistered and blackened, and finally twisted up in a way which I can only compare to what I have seen happen to a quill pen in the flame of a candle. This lasted for some time, during which she never moved her hand, uttered a sound,

or altered the expression of her countenance. She then said, 'Are you satisfied?', to which I answered hastily, 'Quite satisfied'; upon which with great deliberation she removed her finger from the flame, saying 'Now, may I go?' To this I assented, and she moved down to the slope of the pile. Round this she was marched in a noisy procession two or three times, and then ascended it, laying herself down on her side with her face in her hands like one composing herself to sleep, after which she was covered with light brushwood for several inches, but not so as to prevent her rising, had she been so minded." What is the logical conclusion to be drawn from such unimpeachable evidence? The above incident happened more than a hundred years ago. But here is an Associate Press Telegram dated May 22, 1934, which was published the next day in every newspaper in India :

"GIRLS'S DEATH WHILE HUSBAND DIES"

With a view to predeceasing her husband who was seriously ill a Bengali girl committed suicide by saturating her *sari* in Kerosine and setting fire to it. The condition of her husband, who is a Sub-Inspector in the Bengal Police, and residing in a north Calcutta suburb, grew worse yesterday, and attending physicians gave up all hope of recovery. The girl told her husband that she would prefer to die before him so that they might both be burned on

the same funeral pyre. The husband died within a few hours after the death of his wife, and both were cremated together in deference to the girl's wishes". This is the fourth or fifth case of what may be termed voluntary Sati within the past ten months. There was one in Madras on the 6th of June. And yet how difficult it is for many English-educated Indians, for learned Doctors of Laws even, to conceive of any voluntary Sati at all !

XII. A SWARAJ SOLDIER

UN-INDIAN EDUCATION IN MODERN INDIA:—Strange as it may sound there is very little Indian in the education current in Indian schools and colleges recognised by Government. No moral and religious instruction on even the most general lines is given to boys and girls in Non-Muslim institutions, except in Mission schools where children are unfortunately taught less to appreciate Christianity, more to deride their own religion.* There is no

*Over twenty-five years ago, when I was Head Master of a High School, I pressed on the attention of the then Member of Madras Government in charge of Education the desirability of introducing some general instruction in Morals and Religion, to Hindu boys particularly in our public schools. I placed before him first a Syllabus, then "A Handbook of Morals" adapted to pupils in High School classes. He was pleased to appoint a Committee with Mr. H. S. Stone, a veteran member of the Indian Educational Service, as Chairman, and a number of educationists and public men and my importunate self as members, to report on the question. And the

provision in the curriculum of any Indian University for enabling even advanced students to get any idea of India's higher ideals and Culture. Excepting the little Geography and elementary History that is taught in the lower classes, or the pretentious perversions of Indologists which all higher students specialising in Indian History have got to swallow, there are no general lectures provided on the development of Indian literature or Indian philosophy or Indian Art. Indian students learn in fact more of Ancient Greece and Rome, more of modern Europe and America; they know more of Plato's philosophy and Roman law, more of the history of the Reformation, of the French Revolution, or the American War of Independence, more of Darwin and Herbert Spencer, more of Mill and Fawcett than they know of the tribes and dialects of Ancient India, or of Indian colonies in Mesopotamia if not Egypt, or in Sumatra and Java; of Vyasa, Valmiki, and Kalidasa, or Kapila and Patanjali, or Sankara and Ramanuja, or of Chaitanya and Tulsi Das or Guru Govind. Is it any wonder that of the products of such education the vast majority are Indian only in body, but

Committee after very careful consideration accepted my contention that it was possible to give instruction in Morals and Religion on non-sectarian lines, and recommended that such instruction might be imparted wherever the Managers and Head Masters desired it. But very few Managers and Head Masters would waste time on any subject which did not count in the Public examination!

European in thought and ideals? that they cannot find a truly Indian solution whether for their social, or economic or political problems? The crowning tragedy of it all is that few Indian "leaders" are at all aware that there is a higher Culture in India worth preserving; few Indian Ministers in charge of Education during the past fifteen years, if not more, have felt the need for introducing into the Universities in their charge any course of studies in or lectures on "Indian Culture." The fact is that even the Indian History taught in Indian schools and colleges has aimed less at showing the development of India's present from the past, more at emphasising the supposed inestimable value of all the modern machinery and institutions that British rule has introduced into the country. That is how India's vocal politicians know far less of what Abbe Dubois and Munro and Elphinstone, or even the Decentralisation Commission have said about Indian Culture in general or Village Panchayat administration in particular, than they know about the Morley-Minto or Montagu-Chelmsford Reforms, about Provincial Autonomy and Central Responsibility!

A PATRIOT'S PROTEST:—Thus from among English-educated Indians have come forth few independent thinkers or investigators, few who truly combined in them the best fruits of European knowledge and Indian culture as Swami

Vivekananda or Swami Rama Tirtha did, or again as much as Lokamanya Tilak or Desabandhu Das did. To Tilak we owe the very formula: "Swaraj is my birthright, and I will have it". Das tried to place before his countrymen both a proper conception of the Swaraj ideal and a sound outline of Swaraj constitution. Das founded the Swarajist Political Party in 1923; but as evidenced by his Congress Presidential Speech at Gaya in Decr. 1922, Das was verily an apostle of the highest Swarajist religion, who felt that "the truth of all truths is that the outer Leela of God reveals itself in history. Individual, Society, Nation, Humanity are the different aspects of that very Leela; and no scheme of self-government which is practically true, and which is really practical can be based on any other Philosophy of life. . . . This is the soul of Indian thought, and this is the ideal towards which the recent thought of Europe is slowly but surely advancing". Similarly, in trying to point out the scheme of Government that Indians should aspire for, Das declared: "No system of government which is not for the people and by the people can ever be regarded as the true foundation of Swaraj. I am firmly convinced that a Parliamentary Government is not a Government by the people and for the people. Many of us believe that the Middle class must win Swaraj for the masses. I do not believe

in the possibility of any class movement being ever converted into a movement for Swaraj. If to-day the British Government grants provincial autonomy in the provinces, with responsibility in the central government, I, for one, will protest against it, because that will inevitably lead to the concentration of power in the hands of the Middle class. I do not believe that the Middle class will then part with their power. How will it profit India, if in place of the white Beauracracy that now rules over her, there is substituted an Indian Bureaucracy of the middle classes? . . . My ideal of Swaraj will never be satisfied unless the people co-operate with us in its attainment. Any other attempt will inevitably lead to what European Socialists call the 'Bourgeoise' Government. . . . It is for India to show the light to the world,—Swaraj by non-violence, and Swaraj by the people”.

FOUNDATIONS OF SWARAJ:—Das in fact felt as strongly as the American authoress of the “New State” that the superficial democracy of the ballot box and large crowds had failed, while real democracy based on any truly high conception of Humanity—as an aspect of Divinity—had yet to be born. Das was indeed an ardent advocate of the ideal of New Democracy which discards mere numbers, and seeks to base itself on group organisation, on the harmonious integration of human relations and wills, on the evolution of neighbour-

hood consciousness among people who live together in any given area. . And Das stressed this aspect pointedly in the following words in his Congress Presidential Speech at Gaya in 1922: "The democracy which obtains today rests on an attempt at securing a common will by a process of addition. This really means a war of wills, the issue being left to be decided by a mere superiority of numbers. New Democracy discountenances this process of addition, and insists on the discovery of detailed means and methods by which the different wills of a neighbourhood entity may grow into one common collective will". Applying the above principle of State-building to Indian conditions, in view especially of the historic fact that in India the Village organisation had approximated the true democratic ideal, and had proved efficient during many thousands of years, Das declared: "To me the organisation of village life and the practical autonomy of small local centres are more important than either Provincial Autonomy or Central Responsibility; and if the choice lay between the two, I would unhesitatingly accept the autonomy of the local centres. I must not be understood as implying that the village centres must be disconnected units. They must be held together by a system of co-operation and integration. The foundations of real democracy must be laid in small centres—not gradual decentralisation

which implies a previous centralisation—but a gradual integration of the practically autonomous small centres into one living harmonious whole. What is wanted is a human State, not a mechanical contrivance. . . . To frame such a scheme of Government regard must, therefore, be had—

(1) to the formation of local centres more or less on the lines of the ancient village system in India ;

(2) to the growth of larger and larger groups out of the integration of these village centres ;

(3) the unifying State should be the result of similar growth ;

(4) the village centres and the larger groups must be practically autonomous ;

(5) the residuary power of control must remain in the Central Government, but the exercise of such power should be exceptional, and for that purpose proper safeguards should be provided, so that the practical autonomy of the local centres may be maintained, and at the same time the growth of the Central Government into a really unifying State may be possible."

GANDHIAN DIVERSIONS:—Both the Swaraj ideal formulated by Das, and the general scheme outlined by him proved too good for the prevailing slave-mentality of contemporary leaders, whether they hailed from among the Gandhian "No-changers," or from the Liberal and Justicite and similar camps, who afterwards (in 1929) drew up

the mendacious Nehru Committee's Report. The Gandhian No-changers did not forgive Das, as long as he lived, for having questioned Gandhi's omniscience; and they coalesced with the Pro-changers, as the Swarajists were known within the Congress camp, only after the death of Das in 1925. It was India's misfortune that Das did not live long enough to organise well the Swarajist Party he had founded, or to popularise the Swaraj scheme he had conceived. Indeed Das's untimely death removed from Indian public life the one man who could hold his own against Mr. Gandhi, who could in any measure counteract the volcanic outbursts of Gandhi's destructive genius. And so Mr. Gandhi has managed to keep himself in the lime-light through rabid advocacy of Mass Civil Disobedience for some years, of individual Civil Disobedience later, now through "Salt Marches" against the "Satanic Government," now through supererogatory fasts against the Premier's "Communal Award!" Of late, being forced by Lord Willingdon to retire from active politics, he has discovered in a "Hraijan" movement quite ample scope for all his erratic Mahatmaic genius—whether to proclaim that all hereditary cow-killers and liquor-mongers are *Harijans* or godly men, and that all caste Hindus are sinners, or to tour about the country receiving valuable addresses and more valuable purses with

which to establish the kingdom of God on earth! Other geniuses less erratic and more worldly have found it more profitable to exploit Gandhism and rehabilitate their wonted bluff against the bargaining Britisher who somehow seems of late to think that the time has come for his retiring from India with as good grace as possible. For these reasons Das's conception of Swaraj "by the people and for the people" proved too good for the times. Now, as the irony of Fate will have it, not only has Mr. Gandhi banned all Civil Disobedience from the Congress, he has also approved of the entry of Congress-men into the Legislatures. Can a more thorough exposure of Gandhi's reckless diversions, or a more triumphant justification of Das's high statesmanship be imagined? But do Gandhians truly repent for their past sins? How many of them have taken pains to reflect carefully upon Das's warning against Provincial Autonomy, and Central Responsibility and all the rest of the false Democracy of Numbers? How many have studied carefully Das's constructive suggestions for laying the foundations on which alone any real political Swaraj can be evolved in India? Have Gandhians thought of any constructive scheme of Swaraj at all? If they have not, what is the significance of their present cry in favour of Council-entry—except that they do not want to leave all the loaves and fishes of political power in the hands of those who have enjoyed them till now?

XIII. A SWARAJ OUTLINE

NEED FOR RIGHT FOUNDATIONS :—As a friend and follower of the late Desabandhu Das I often felt a vague desire to work out his Swaraj scheme in some detail. This desire grew stronger during my visit to England last year. For I was asked by several people there who came to know about my opposition to the White Paper scheme : "what is your alternative?". My immediate reply to them was that a rough alternative I had indicated in my Memorandum to the Joint Parliamentary Committee, which with a few reference books I could easily amplify. But until a large number of responsible politicians both in England and in India discovered the perils of the superficial democracy of numbers in general, and of the White Paper recommendations in particular, how could I expect them to consider seriously any alternative? Since then, however, events have been developing rapidly in the world at large tending to paralyse the old economic and political machinery in very many countries. Neither Britain nor India can any longer contemplate complacently on the representative institutions of the nineteenth century. In any case, there must be more people now than before to consider with an open mind the merits of any alternative basis on which to build the self-governing institutions of the future. It is in this hope that I now

venture to present to the public a rough outline of the Swaraj constitution that, I think, is adapted to Indian conditions. I do not claim any finality or perfection for my outline. All that I claim is that I have tried to keep in mind the principle of group organisation on which New Democracy seeks to be raised. Like Mr. Das I have tried to emphasise how the foundations of any Swaraj for India must be laid deep in Rural and Urban Autonomy, in local areas where materials for evolving "the consciousness of the integrated neighbourhood" are available; how these local areas should be linked up carefully in order to evolve the District, and Provincial, and All-India spheres of responsible Government in due course. This is the principle on which the following rough outline is based: autonomy or Swaraj of local areas at the bottom, and over it District, Provincial, and All-India Swaraj in due course of integration.

A. RURAL AUTONOMY

(1) India is mainly an agricultural country. The bulk of her people live in rural areas, namely, 241 millions out of 270, in British India. From time immemorial they have had their common concerns administered by Panchayats or Councils of Elders—literally, "Councils of Five". The villages under these Panchayats were, according to Munro and Elphinstone tiny little Republics, where the

masses had flourished for ages even though States and Empires rose and fell. The traditions about these Panchayats are still cherished by the people.

(2) In any case real Democracy in India can be built only on widespread and complete Rural Autonomy, and of course Urban Autonomy. The power to interfere in exceptional cases of mal-administration may be vested in District authorities ; but, generally, the ordinary administration of all village concerns should be vested in the Panchayats.

(3) There are some 500,000 villages in India, of which over 135,000 contain each a population ranging from 500 to 5000. If a serious attempt were made it should not be difficult to establish in a year or two 200,000 or even 250,000 Panchayats - one for every big village or group of villages within an area of two to three sq. miles. Each Panchayat may have on it 5 to 10 members, representing all the chief communities, or sub-communities, or interests in the village in consonance with old traditions, and including the village Officials such as the Munsiff, Karnam, and other head-men. The Panchayat should be in charge of all the village common properties, and be responsible for their administration, subject to supervision and advice from the District authorities.

(4) *The members of the Village Panchayats must be the general electors to the District Council,*

and to the lower Chamber in the Provincial Legislature. As on an average there will be 800 to 1,000 Panchayats in every District area; there will be 5,000 to 10,000 votes roughly from each District for the general seats in each Provincial lower House; or between a million and half and two million voters for the whole of India, each of them possessing an individual stake in group-organisation, and some idea of common interests, and needs. A million such voters representing agricultural interests all over India can be expected to use their power of vote far better, with greater intelligence, and sense of responsibility than the 38 millions proposed by the White Paper of whom less than 18 millions are "literate" and more than 35 millions will easily fall victims to all kinds of undue influence.

B. DISTRICT AND PROVINCIAL AUTONOMY

(1) The various Provinces of British India have developed in various ways; they are not constituted on any rational principle. The major Provinces are too huge in area; some of them are two or even three times as large as England; and they are composed of diverse communities, castes, creeds, languages and interests. No Provincial Autonomy can at all work even tolerably well without a division of the existing Provincial areas into smaller, more homogeneous ones at least linguistically. (2) Even existing District areas

are too large and heterogeneous in many cases. There should be a re-organisation of these also in consonance with the ideal of integrated group consciousness. (3) In every District thus formed there must be a District Council composed of 60 to 100 members inclusive of Officials, which should be responsible for the District administration in general, for integrating, without interfering unduly in, the work of the Village Panchayats and Urban Boards within the District area. The non-official members of the District Councils should be elected by the members of the Village Panchayats ; at least the bulk of them. Some seats may be reserved for major landlords, or commerce or Industry ; some also for " minority communities ". (4) Until Village Panchayats are formed as indicated above, it is not worth while to alter the existing franchise to the District Councils or Boards ; or even to the lower Chamber of the Provincial Legislature.

(5) *Second Chambers in Provinces.*—There must be a second Chamber in every Province to act as a brake against any blind democracy of numbers in a single chamber. The White Paper recommends second Chambers for only three Provinces ; but even of these the proposed constitution is very defective ; it will only lead to a reduplication of the lower chamber, which is worse than useless. In a general way, each Upper House should provide adequate representation to the following

interests and talents in the Province—namely, 1. Landholders, 2. Commerce and Industry, 3. Labour, 4. Learning both Eastern and Western, 5. Religious interests, 6. Administrative Experience. To a very limited extent nomination by Government may be allowed. Taking for example the present Province of Madras, with an area of 143,870 sq. miles, and a population of 45.6 millions, of whom 41.2 are Hindus, 3.3 are Muslims, and 1.7 are Christians, I would suggest an Upper House of 70 members to be distributed as follows :

1. Landholders, in five groups, North, North-West, Centre, South, South- West ; 2 for each group	...	10
2. Commerce and Industry, Indian 5, European 5	10
3. Labour other than agricultural	...	2
4. Learning and Culture : for the three Universities 12, for Pandits 2, for Maulvies 2	16
5. Religion : For the five Hindu Mutts 5, For Temple trusts in N., N.W., C., S., S.W., 5 ; for recognised Hindu Religious Associations 3, Total Hindu 13 ; Muslim 2, Chris- tian 2	17

6. Administrative Experience—to be elected by retired officials drawing annual pension of Rs. 1200 or more.	8
7. To be nominated by Government, as representing Special interests ...	7
	<hr/>
Total ...	70
	<hr/>

On the above plan, with necessary modifications, an Upper Chamber must be constituted in every Province where Provincial Autonomy is introduced.

C. CENTRAL GOVERNMENT

There must be a Central Government for British India to integrate, harmonise, and advise the various autonomous Provinces. This presupposes a sound distribution of the spheres and functions of Government in local areas, in Districts, and in Provinces, and at the Centre, which will be in consonance with the Autonomy sought to be introduced in every sphere.

(1) Subjects of All-India importance only will be, or should be, dealt with by the Central Government.

(2) "Responsibility" in the Central Government can come logically only after the Provinces all become fully autonomous. Pending this, with a view to placate the vocal politicians without whose co-operation the Government cannot be carried on, a

certain measure of Responsibility may be introduced in the Central Government also immediately. (3) The statutory subordination of the Government of India to the Secretary of State or the British Cabinet must be repealed. On the other hand there must be an Indian Minister in the British Government appointed by the King-Emperor on the recommendation of the Central Legislature in India. (4) That Legislature, as now, must consist of two Chambers; the numerical strength of both should be increased; and adequate provision should be made for giving representation therein to Learning, Religious interests, and to administrative talents, in addition to the interests now provided for. (5) The Military Department should cease to be a symbol of India's dependence, indifferent to Indian opinion. (6) The Political Department of the Government of India should be radically re-organised so as to curtail its old-world autocracy.

D. ALL INDIA FEDERATION

The need for an All-India Federation will certainly come to be felt when large problems of international importance as between India as a whole and the rest of the world arise, or when practical internal problems arise seeking to integrate the interests of British India on the one hand and of Indian States on the other. But care should

be taken that the Federation, whenever it may come into being, does not interfere with the autonomy whether of the Provinces or of the States.

E. PROTECTION TO RELIGION

Above all else, it must be the aim of the Government in every sphere to protect the religion and Culture of every Community, to help each to develop from within, to prevent all outside interference with any. A statutory provision prohibiting legislative interference in any religion, except on the initiation of the religionists concerned, is only the negative aspect of the duty of every secular government to help the development of the higher self among people at large.

A WORD OF CAUTION:—The above outline is purely suggestive ; and in no part of it complete. Village units there are ; they have existed from time immemorial ; but they are not autonomous. The Provincial and even District areas at present obtaining are quite artificial, the result of historic accident or of administrative shuffling, based on no rational principle. Their re-organisation in consonance with the principle of "integrated consciousness" essential for true democracy, cannot be accomplished without insight and determination. Moreover, the "local self-government" at present allowed to Municipalities, and District or Taluk

Boards, and the so-called Village Unions, is all quite superficial, and mechanical, and unduly costly. To replace it all by real, dynamic autonomy in every area would require even far greater insight and determination and patience. And yet, unless we have well-organised and fully autonomous local areas, and Districts, and Provinces, how can any real Self-government or Swaraj be evolved for the whole of India? But can British statesmen obsessed with their Parliamentary model muster sufficient vision and determination to plan the right sort of democracy for India? Or can Indian politicians clamouring for cheap Dominion Status muster sufficient courage and faith to lay the right foundations on which to raise any edifice of real Swaraj? Lastly, we must guard ourselves against imagining any Self-government or political Swaraj as an end in itself: it is, and must always be only a means towards securing the economic and cultural progress of the people concerned. Life is one organic whole; it needs the healthy inter-relation and functioning of all organs simultaneously, and harmoniously.

XIV. SOCIAL PROBLEMS OF MODERN INDIA

LAWS OF SOCIAL ORGANISMS:— Group Swaraj presupposes group organisation on right lines.

Now, the higher an organism, the more numerous, and more specialised are its organs; and its all-round well-being depends on each organ performing its legitimate function efficiently, and in harmony with other organs. When any organ—*e.g.*, eye or ear or hand or leg—is injured, or fails to function well, the life of the organism to that extent becomes defective; or, indeed, if the organ be of vital importance—*e.g.*, the brain or heart or lungs or intestines—its functional failure may lead to the death of the organism. This is the Biological law. A very similar Sociological law may be said to govern all social or group organisms: the well-being of every human group organism depends upon the proper and harmonious functioning of its different organs. In the case of the individual or bodily organism Nature ensures the observance of the biological law; that is, the body dies naturally and perceptibly when its vital organs cease to function. The sociological law in the case of group organisms is less perceptible, but not the less operative. It is less perceptible because in the modern world few social organisms exist, constituted on definite principles of group-organisation; it is not less operative because in the perpetual struggle between higher and lower forms and grades of life the worse-organised groups, communities, or nations get sooner enfeebled, and so disintegrate and perish. It is a pity that the force of this law, its

full implication, is not yet perceived by modern "scientific thinkers",* or statesmen who pay more attention to armaments and tariffs than to organisation or to education of groups on right lines. It is a still greater pity that under the hollow plea of individual freedom attempts are made to break the cohesive power of old group organisations that have withstood the wear and tear of time.

REFORM ZEAL IN MODERN INDIA:—Such destructive attempts, with very good intentions doubtless, have been going on in modern India for over a

* In fact modern "science" does not appear to have as yet discovered all the laws governing the social and cultural, or even the economic and political life of mankind. Scientists are coming to recognise that Nature is not altogether inanimate; that in every material object in the phenomenal world, whether or not in a form perceptible to the naked eye, there is a life—or *sat* as ancient Indian philosophers called it. But is there not also in every object *chit* or intelligence or purposiveness, however limited, conditioned or latent that intelligence may be? In the case of human beings especially has not Evolution consisted verily in the ever-increasing manifestation or emergence of the intelligence latent in each, although in measures and rates varying from individual to individual? Again, to what extent has diversity co-existed with uniformity in Evolution? Has progress been all in one straight ascending line? May not, indeed do not, human beings occupying diverse mental and moral levels live in almost every country, and influence one another for better or for worse? How should they be grouped and integrated in order to secure the progress of a country, if not of humanity as a whole? Questions like these arise when "scientific" writers describe—with all the imagination of poets how "primitive man" was "haphazard as an animal", though "he was already a tool-using and fire-making creature"; how "from this wandering

hundred years, the Reformers having sprung mainly from among Hindus, from those who had been dazzled by the superficial glamour of European "civilisation", or of Christian monotheism. Raja Ram Mohan Roy, and Keshub Chander Sen, and other Brahmo Samajists, Arya Samajists later, Social Reformers pure and simple, and of late the Gandhians—all have been hurling their most vociferous thunderbolts against orthodox Hinduism in general, and against the Caste System in particular. Fifty years ago the most militant challenges used to be hurled calling upon Hinduism to

and hunting condition, man made a very extraordinary stride forward, very rapidly . . . in something between five thousand and ten thousand generations"; how "the gist of the change was that while hitherto man had subsisted upon the natural food supply of the country in which he lived, he now began to cultivate and store food". Such is the scientific account of "the dawn of social and economic life". And much in the same vein the "scientific" description is given of man's development from the primitive to the savage, then to the semi-savage or semi-civilised, and lastly to the present "civilised" stage; the assumption throughout being that the development has been made not in conformity with any inner urge, but haphazardly, under external pressure of some kind, in order to lessen physical toil, in order to gain mastery over the hard forces of external nature; the last stage, particularly, being traced to certain accidental discoveries whose practical application has enabled the modern "civilised" man to gain the long-coveted mastery over the external world. Whether all this be quite correct or not, "Science" is still too obsessed with discoveries in the external world to study deeply man's own complex nature and development. Hence it is that while Science describes in detail the biological laws governing bodily organisms, its account of the sociological laws governing human group-organisms is still very perfunctory.

justify itself "at the bar of Reason". And Hinduism did justify itself; nay it was shown to be the Universal Religion of Humanity by God-seers like Sri Ramakrishna Paramahansa and Swami Vivekananda and Swami Rama Tirtha. During the past twentyfive years the attacks have been less on Hinduism proper, more upon the Caste System recognised by Hinduism. Political aspirations have combined with social reform zeal in these later attacks. "In the light of modern civilisation" the older reformers had said, "the caste system must go". "On the altar of the Motherland" have cried the later "national" leaders, "if India should gain her rightful place among the nations of the world, all caste and communal and religious differences that divided and weakened her must be willingly given up". These attempts at religious and social reform have been more persistent among Hindus than among Muslims or other religionists for the following reasons. (1) English secular education has spread more among Hindus than among others, unsettling old habits and beliefs. (2) The average Westerner, and after him the English-educated Indian, finds greater difficulty in harmonising with the transcendental philosophy of Hinduism its complex outer rituals, and caste differentiations. (3) The average moderner, who has already pointed out, is yet ignorant of the laws governing social organisms, is unable to discover any high principle

underlying the Hindu social order; and so interprets Caste organisation as imposed by religious tyranny and supported by religious superstition. (4) The Hindu social order, for the matter of it, though originally organised on the highest principles of group integration, does not now exist as originally devised; it has lost one of its vital organs—the Kshatriya order, charged with the supreme duty of safeguarding the proper functioning of the other organs. A reorganisation of Hindu society, a reintegration of its chief organic functions, is intrinsically desirable, nay necessary. But this can be done only by leaders well versed in the Science and Art of social organisation, not by blind advocates of superficial Equality and Freedom—of Equality in a world where inequalities physical, mental, moral seem to be as much an unalterable part of Nature's plan as the alternating seasons, and of Freedom in a world where life from the cradle to the grave is one growing bondage unto all except those who have freed themselves from the bonds of their lower nature.

“EMANCIPATION OF INDIAN WOMEN”:—Next to the Caste system, the “slavery” in which Indian women—both Hindu, and Muslim—are supposed to be held, has been a subject on which the rhetoric of social reformers has dilated abundantly. A detailed exposure of how the reformers conduct their campaign with greater zeal than knowledge,

will fill a whole volume. I shall therefore content myself with the following few observations. (1) In this matter, as in several others, the Indian reformer is obsessed with the outward glamour of what obtains, or is supposed to obtain, among the juvenile nations of the West who have yet to discover and practice the Science and Art of Man's higher Life, who have yet to realise that man's higher place in evolution demands of him more, not less, of self-restraint than is necessary for lower animals, especially in the matter of eating and mating. (2) The plea of "equal opportunities for man and woman", like the plea of "equal opportunities for all human beings," means or should mean not that every individual member of every organised society should have facilities to do whatever each likes or fancies to be high, but that every one must have facilities for developing as much of what is best in him or her as may be possible within his or her environment, and for contributing that best towards the well-being of the group-organisation of which he or she is a part. (3) On this principle family life, social life, political citizenship—each should be valued primarily not for the sake of any possible power or enjoyment available through each, but for the opportunity offered by each for self-discipline and for selfless service. (4) This is the Hindu ideal. This explains the sanctity of Marriage and of Motherhood to an

orthodox Hindu. This is how in Hindu society every girl is given an "equal opportunity" for honourable-wifedom and for divine motherhood, together with the mixed pleasures and responsibilities of either.

(5) It is deplorable how thousands of English-educated Indians—some few Indian women too, alas! of late—have been so misled by the *asuric* glamour of the West as to be incapable of understanding the Indian, which is also the right, ideal of Womanhood.

(6) I do not however suggest that the regulations and customs at present in vogue regarding marriage or inter-sex relations among Hindus are all perfect. We should certainly do our best to rectify proved evils, but on right lines which will not turn bad into worse. (7) Above all else, steps should be taken to help men and women not to attain the seeming freedom of beasts and birds, but to so live together as to mould a Heaven out of earth—a Heaven verily over which preside God the Father and God the Mother in indissoluble unity and perfect harmony.

"ELEVATION OF THE DEPRESSED CLASSES":—Another difficult problem, in modern India which the blind zeal of superficial reformers has only made more difficult of solution, is with regard to the elevation of what are called the "Depressed Classes". On this subject, again, a great deal may be written; but I must content myself with the following few observations. (1) The problem is primarily econo-

mic and hygienic, and only secondarily social or religious. The classes under reference are very poor economically, although there are others in India who are quite as poor; and, again, speaking generally, these classes by birth, breeding, and tendencies are very unclean. They also pursue trades—such as butchering, tanning, cobbling, liquor-drawing, fishing—which the Caste Hindus regard as very sinful. (2) Every Hindu, including the Panchama or out-caste, believes, and rightly believes, in the Laws of Karma and Rebirth; he believes that his own past life-deeds account for his present birth and environment, and *vasanas* or tendencies latent in his mind; that, nevertheless, doing the *dharma* of his present life he can and must so live as to evolve his higher nature. (3) Every true Hindu, likewise holds that there is a "Divinity deep seated in the hearts of all beings"; that even the seemingly unclean Chandala can, and indeed some day must, realise the God in him; but till then he is what he makes himself at each stage. (4) Indian History records how in the past, from among these outcastes verily came forth more than one God-seer, whose images are kept and worshipped by Caste Hindus in their most sacred temples. (5) For these and similar reasons Mr. Gandhi's latest propoganda that all Caste Hindus are sinners responsible for the present condition of the Depressed Classes

that these latter are all Harijans or godly men, is quite unsound both historically and philosophically; it can only embitter—as already it has begun to do in several places—the old amicable relations between the castes and the outcastes. (6) Reform based on our higher, spiritual nature alone can save us whether individually or collectively. In other words for a right solution of the problem before us we must take steps to inculcate among all Hindus, caste or outcaste, the supreme Religion of *Bhakti*, *Prapatti*, *Kainkarya*—of God-love, Self-surrender, and Service—as lived and taught by not a few saints and seers of old. It is unfortunate that Mr. Gandhi talks so glibly of soul-force, and God's Grace, and only talks, and misleads himself and others by his cheap talk!

XV. THE MAIN MODERN PROBLEM

AN OLD PARABLE:—We read in an old story book how at one time there lived a hard-working peasant who often felt as if his limbs would break under the weight of his daily toil. As often the thought came to him how happy he would be if with the help of some magician he got a giant as his servant who could do all his work. And a magician he did chance to meet, to whom he told his wish; and the magician agreed to help him—but on one condition, that he must keep his giant-servant always

busy : else the giant would eat him up ! “ Never fear ; ” replied the simple swain ; no lack of work will be where I am ! ” And so he got a giant to be his servant. And at first, to his great delight, the peasant found that the giant could work much harder than himself without any sign of fatigue ; he found too that the giant could do every job entrusted to him however hard, with amazing quickness. The giant could do in five minutes what he and a hundred others like him could not together do in five days or in five months even. This began to cause him some anxiety ; indeed before the end of the first week the poor peasant-master began to feel troubled as to how to keep this wonderful servant of his always busy ; for whether it was building a new hut for him, or digging a new well, or removing an obstructing hillock—whatever task was assigned to the giant, he finished it in no time, and came to his master shouting “ what next ? ”. And the poor master soon found that it was not after all so easy to keep his man always at work.

THE GIANT IN MODERN LIFE :—Does not this parable fit in admirably with what the modern world is beginning to feel about all the giant power through gigantic machinery and gigantic organisation it has managed to acquire ? How to keep the giant of modern armaments under control, or the giant of “ unplanned capitalism ”, or the giant of “ econo-

mic nationalism " under proper check, how to end the "international anarchy" that has grown up "in a world which has contracted enormously in terms of time and space"—are not these the questions that confront our modern "experts"? How may modern nations maintain all the latest industrial and economic and social and political machinery in efficient working order; else, will not they perish in the "crash of civilisation" that seems inevitable? Is not this the problem before the world's "scientific" thinkers? How, within the space of a few years, comparatively, the modern world has begun to feel unhappy over its erstwhile boasted "conquests"! "How shall it profit a man", cried the Eastern Jesus of old, "if he gains the whole world, but lose his own soul?" Modern nations have only lost their soul; they have not gained the world either; on the other hand they are beginning to fear that they may soon lose their body also!

MODERN PARADOXES:—Indeed the "progress" made by the modern world has been towards retrogression. Each limb of the body politic now wants to rule, and to rule too according to its own standards. Thus the industries engaged in the manufacture of munitions seek to influence the Disarmament problem in each country. Similarly the industries set up for the manufacture of motor cars and aeroplanes, nay of worse luxuries claim,

or will soon claim their right to vote upon any economic or other world-controls which the world's statesmen, left to themselves, may desire to adopt. This verily is a sign of "civilisation" that the hands and the feet of the body politic claim the right to issue mandates to the head and the heart as to how the latter should function. Whatever be the reason, expert writers picture graphically the paradox of "over-production and want", of over-organisation and unemployment in the world's economic spheres. Even more distressing are the paradoxes noticeable in the mental and moral spheres, such as the paradox of over-learning and nescience, of over-civilisation and barbarity. The fact is that people in "modern" countries learn a great deal about almost everything under the sun, about rocks and plants, about the beasts of the field and the fowls of the air, about all that is hidden in the bowels of the earth and of the ocean, but very little about their own complex nature, about the perpetual struggle within them between their lower and higher selves. They pretend to be too busy to trouble themselves with any questions that do not concern them immediately. Even those who belong to the middle and upper leisured classes, who often send Christian Missionaries to make a present of the Holy Bible to the "heathen" in far-off lands, are too engrossed with stocks and shares and market rates, with the latest telegrams

about assaults and abductions, and divorces, and embezzlements, with illustrated reports of balls and weddings, and sports and races : they find little time and less inclination to read the New Testament every day. They perhaps think that the Bible, good as it may be in its own way, is after all a religious book of the olden times ; and has not " Science " once for all driven Religion out of court ?

" A TITANIC STRUGGLE " :—The answer to the above question, thirty years ago, would have been emphatically in the affirmative. Today the answer that comes from those most competent to speak, is as emphatically in the negative. Nay, Science, we are now told " has cleared the boards of the universe for Religion ". This is what we learn from Dr. L. M. Parsons D.Sc., who in his excellent, up-to-date, little book on *The Universe of our Experience*, referring to the present world-crisis says : " The hurricane which threatens, not merely to impede our advance, but to push us backwards, is the spirit of inclusive and excessive mechanization, which, if not resisted successfully, may become all embracing and reduce humanity to the condition of a race of robots. . . . These propensities for mechanical interpretations " of life and personality " *are legacies left us by the materialistic science of the Victorian period, and it may be some considerable time before the community as a whole readjusts itself to the non-mechanistic conceptions*

emerging in the scientific and philosophic thought of the present day. . . . Our hopes are centred in Youth, that it may realize, before it is too late, that mankind is engaged in a titanic struggle in which the forces of psychology, sociology, and life, are at grips with those of misapplied physics, uncontrolled mechanization, and death. At all costs, the rising generation must see that the forces of life are victorious, and a most important step in that direction is the abandonment of the idolatry of physico-chemical realism." (Italics mine). Yes; the struggle today is between the nineteenth century "idolatry of physico-chemical realism", cum Democracy of Numbers, and the new call to realise the higher forces of life, and strive for true Swaraj. The vital, practical problem, in the words of Betrand Russell, is how "to substitute the passions that make for life in place of the present passions that make for universal death". Do the world's statesmen quite realise the nature of this struggle?

XVI. LIGHT FROM THE EAST

GENERAL AWAKENING NEEDED:—It is gratifying to note that some of the greatest scientists and philosophers in the West at the present day—such as Gen. Smuts, Earl (Betrand) Russell, Sir Arthur Eddington, Prof. Haldane, Prof. Lloyd Morgan, Prof. McDougall, Bergson in France, and Croce in

Italy, to mention only some—have come out with their condemnation of the mechanistic science and philosophy of the Victorian age. But, although the rays of the rising sun must first gleam on the mountain peaks, yet until the light spreads to the plains, the world at large does not get its full benefit. So it is in the cultural world today. Modern peoples, in the main, for some generations, have been warming themselves in the false, un-healthy, delirious blaze of artificial light; they think they can carry a machine-made sun or moon with them wherever they go, and bid the same shine whenever they want. They have not yet discovered that they are trafficking in poison.

“How of the sight of means to do ill deeds
Makes deeds ill done!”

wrote Shakespeare truly—the one English poet who had an instinctive vision of life's complicate problems. The “sight of means to do ill deeds” verily explains how modern “civilisation” has run amock; it gives the psychological clue both to the “red war of bombs” and the “white war of tariffs,” to both political anarchy and social Bolhevism, and to the growing cigarette-cinema-contraception craze. What form of World-control can cure modern nations of their present wrong mentality, their false standards, and beastly ideals? As well pointed out Betrand Russell: “Our power to injure

each other has increased so much that malevolent passions have become infinitely more harmful than they were before the spread of industrialism. . . . If men were guided by reason, mere self-preservation might lead them to the new philosophy that is required. But in fact they are governed by their passions ; and the problem is to substitute the passions that make for life in place of the present passions that make for universal death." That is how the noble Earl pleads for " a new philosophy of life." I would say that what is wanted is not so much a *new* philosophy of life as a *true* philosophy in place of the present false, superficial idolum that regards man as a mere social, or at best as a thinking, " animal," and so has helped " the Beast in man to sway over the God within his heart." We want in its place the true culture that will make every man and woman, literate or illiterate, feel instinctively that each one is a ray of the highest, holiest, all-blissful One, a ray " whom no weapons can cleave, nor fire burn." We want the true Art that will instil into the hearts of all " the passions that make for life in place of the present passions that make for universal death."

SCIENCE AND ART OF HIGHER LIFE:—This verily is no " new " philosophy of life, except to those whom Victorian thought has misled to believe that Science and Religion are two different things, quite apart and at conflict, the one based

on "reason", the other resting on "faith". Luckily in India we have not had this conflict between "Science" and "Religion". Our conflicts have been between one religion and another. It is not that there has not been any atheistic or agnostic questioning in India: her *nirishwara Sankhyas*—who denied the existence of a Super-soul or God—have been the earliest and greatest free-thinkers of the world. But the most militant agnosticism, if quite honest and earnest, has culminated in spiritual realisation. Indeed in Indian phraseology the term "*Vidya*" stands for knowledge in general; which may be either *apara* or *para*, either of lower, phenomenal things, or of the higher Noumenal Existence. And *Para Vidya* or Religion, like any other body of knowledge, rests on four kinds of evidence—*pratyaksha* or direct perception, *anumana* or inference, *upamana* or analogy, and *abda* or verbal testimony of others; of which *pratyaksha*, direct realisation, is recognised to be the strongest. And so in India—as perhaps to a greater or less extent in other lands—the truths of Religion have been discovered and taught by *seers*, by those who saw those truths directly. Secondly, this *Para Vidya* or Science and Art of Higher Life has consisted not merely in knowing but in living up to the highest Truth. Its teachers have therefore laid the greatest stress on discipline in every-day life and sense-control, and

intense longing to realise the Truth as necessary preliminaries to any serious quest after the *Para Vidya*. And in every generation in India there have been some possessing these preliminary qualifications—sometimes in a form or measure not quite known to themselves!—each one of whom has met a “God-seer” in flesh and blood, and has been initiated directly in God-knowledge. That was what happened to the youth who later became famous as Swami Vivekananda, and to a number of others during the last generation. This is what happens in every generation unto those who in previous lives, if not in their present, have learnt the preliminary lessons in sense-control necessary for the evolution of the higher Self. Yes; there are God-seers in every generation to initiate the qualified few into the Higher Life. For the book of Life is never closed, nor the book of Revelation!

THE DHARMIC PATH:—But the majority of people whether in India or elsewhere seek *artha* and *kama*, wealth and pleasure, more keenly than *moksha* or self-realisation. There are many too who desire happiness both here and elsewhere. Not all are possessed with “God-madness”. As the Lord Sri Krishna has declared: “Of thousands of men only a few seek the highest goal; and of those that seek, only a few succeed in knowing Me aright”. In other words human beings fall into various

classes and groups according to their inner desires and aptitudes and qualifications ; although to every one in his own time, "today, or tomorrow or at the end of a cycle", is bound to come a dissatisfaction with worldly things, and longing for higher life ; for in every one abides the deathless Spirit struggling to triumph over the bonds of the flesh. And all worldly life is in fact a period of struggle between the lower and the higher self in each human being. How may the average man be helped in this struggle ; how may he be helped to evolve "the passions that make for life" ? By setting before him the path of Dharma is the unequivocal answer that comes from India's saints and seers of every generation. Now, Dharma, as we have already noticed, teaches every individual to regard himself as part or limb of an organised whole. It teaches him that his birth and environment are not due to blind chance ; that they are due to old affinities between himself and those around him ; that his interests are bound up with the interests of those others. It teaches that every man or woman by doing his or her *swadharma*, that is duty incumbent upon him or her at each stage in relation to the environment, serves to secure the best interests of all including himself or herself. It teaches how true Renunciation consists more in internal detachment than in external giving up of worldly things ; how even wealth can

be acquired, or pleasure enjoyed, without attachment, and in the pursuit of the householder's *dharma*. It is thus that Dharma seeks to inculcate among all "the passions that make for life in place of the passions that make for death" such as insatiate sense-craving breeds. Is not this what modern nations need most, among whom the militant claim for "Rights"—the rights of man, the rights of woman, of each interest, community, nation—and the up-to-date "scientific" weapons with which each claim is sought to be enforced, spell violent death to one and all alike?

WANTED AN I. D. L.:—But is there any agency in existence at the present day which will and can undertake to spread among all peoples on earth this *Universal Gospel Of The Higher Man*? Can this great task be left to the League of Nations or to any of its Committees? The League has so far been a failure: that seems to be the verdict of practically all who have looked into its work. "The League was founded to make the world safe for Democracy: it made the world safe for Diplomacy": this is how a writer pithily sums up its achievements. Can the preaching of this universal Gospel of Man be left to any of the militant religious Missions that hold that only through this one or through that other Messiah can all God's children reach their Father's all-gracious feet? It is needless to stress the point further. My own humble

suggestion will be that all those ardent souls who feel strongly that the greatest service they can render to their brothers and sisters all the world over at the present day, will be to deliver to them the message of the Science and Art of Higher Life as indicated above, may join together to form the nucleus of what in time, under the guidance of the "Elder brothers of humanity" may develop, under whatever name, into an International Dharmic League. Such an I. D. L. may devote itself with zeal and with pleasure to spreading over the modern world the ancient truth that every human being is a ray of the supreme Ishwara, the all-pervading, all-blissful "One only without a second". This is the religion of God-love that Jesus tried to inculcate; this is the religion of absolute surrender to the One, only Allah that Mohammed desired to enforce; this is the religion of Nirvana that every Buddha tried to be a witness of; this is the immortal Vidya that every Indian God-seer has demonstrated in his own life. This ideal alone, through some I. D. L., will lead the modern man to true conquest—namely, over his changing, mortal, lower self—and to true Self-realisation, to the Bliss "of Divinity deep seated in the hearts of all beings". This is the only sure path to World-weal. It is at hand unto all that will desist from mutual slaughter, unto all that intensely desire universal peace and harmony.

XVII. INDIA THROUGH THE AGES

PERVERSIONS OF INDOLOGISTS :—A hundred and fifty years ago European savants were disposed to regard the “discovery of Sanskrit” as a forgery. A hundred and odd years ago the great Macaulay, in the plenitude of his ignorance of Oriental languages and culture, declared that “a single shelf of a good European library was worth all the native literature of India and Arabia”. Fifty years ago the tendency among European Indologists was to try and discover a Hellenic origin for every branch of Indian literature and art. Thus according to Weber and Windest the Indian drama was modelled on the Greek. According to Max Muller the Hindus learnt the art of writing from the Greeks or Persians. Prof. Macdonnel has no doubt that the Hindus learnt their Astronomy from Greek sources. Ferguson has advocated that India borrowed her Architecture from Greece. Niebuhr believed that everything good in India came from Hellas! The first batch of these Indologists, as pointed out by Max Muller in his *History Of Sanskrit Literature*, were mere curiosity-hunters, very imperfectly acquainted with Sanskrit, though freely indulging in fanciful theories. The second or Literary school of Indologists, of which Max Muller himself was a formidable authority, relied almost entirely on their new-fledged Philology for their no less fanciful

generalisations regarding the Indo-European or Aryan Man, his original home, language, religion, and later adventures. The latest school of Indologists may be described as Epigraphists; these have certainly done good work by way of unearthing valuable archæological materials; but even these, in the main, have only sought to back up the more important conclusions of the Philologists. Thus the superficial identification of Sandrocttus of the Greeks with Chandragupta Maurya of the Indian Puranas, and of Piyadasi of the Edicts with Asokavardhana *Maurya* of Indian tradition, continues to be the "anchor-sheet of Indian chronology". Or, again, Dr. Fleet's no less superficial reconstruction of the chronology of the Gupta period has been accepted at its face-value, without any scrutiny worth the name.* The net result is that no history of Ancient India, even tolerably accurate, has been written up to date. It is impossible to refer here to

*Dr. Fleet's Volume is valuable as a collection of inscriptions of the Gupta period. But his chronological reading of them is all wrong; for it is based on his woeful misinterpretation of Kumara Gupta's "Mandassor inscription" (dated 493 of some Malava Era); wherein the simple Sanskrit words "malavanam gana-sthitya" meaning "according to the calculation current among the Malavas" is distorted to mean "from the establishment of the tribal constitution of the Malavas";—which "tribal constitution" drawn entirely from Dr. Fleet's fertile fancy, is stated by him as having taken place in 57 B. C. How many later "scholars", who have accepted Dr. Fleet's chronology of the Gupta period, at all know how that chronology has been computed?

all the myths about Aryan and Dravidian and "Adi-Dravida" races and cultures; nor all the chronological fictions about pre-Maurya and Maurya and Gupta and later dynasties, nor all the impudent estimates of what are called Vedic, Puranic, and later or Classical periods of Indian literature. It is enough here to note that the theory of an Aryan invasion and colonisation of Northern India from somewhere in Central Asia or Europe is quite fictitious; the synchronism of Chandragupta Maurya with Alexander the Great is based on distorted evidence; the Yavanas (Yonas) of the Puranas and the inscriptions were not post-Alexandrian Greeks; and not one of the dates assigned to Buddha, or Vikramaditya, or Kalidasa or Sankara is even approximately correct.

TRUTH STRANGER THAN FICTION:—A careful study of all the available evidence—geological, anthropological, philological, literary, and archæological, including the rich Puranic materials which till now have been either wholly ignored or fancifully distorted—leads to the conclusion that India's pre-historic story goes to at least ten thousand years. The regions north and south of the Himalayas formed in all probability one—if not the sole—cradle of humanity in the present world-cycle. The earliest people of India or Bharata-varsha consisted of several clans or tribes speaking several allied Prakrit (natural) dialects; from one or more

of which dialects first Vedic, later literary, or classical, Sanskrit was developed. From other dialects were derived languages which later came to be called Asuri, Paisachi, and so on. From other dialects still developed the later literary Prakrits, such as those used in the classical Dramas for female and inferior characters; and likewise literary Vernaculars like Dravida (Damida, Tamil). Ancient India included the province of Gandhara (Kandahar) and of Makara (Makaran). The Barbaras (Babals, Babels) and Yavanas (Yonas, Ionas), and Sakas or Para-sakas (Persians) were some of the heterodox tribes who in pre-historic times migrated westward. The Kurus, Panchalas, Kosalas, Kasis, and others occupied the Indo-Gangetic or central regions. The Mithils and Pancha Gaudas spread eastward. The Dravidas whose first provincial home lay—according to Varahamihira's Brihat-Samhita, Chap. XV—not in Southern but in South-Western India, north of Konkan and south of Guzerat, branched later into Pancha (five) Dravidas—namely, Kurjaras or Guzeratis, Maharashtras, Karnatakas, Andhras, and Dravidas or Tamils proper. The Parasakas who went west founded Persia, and were in intimate contact with India in every period. The Babals and Yonas, who also migrated west, were perhaps the founders of Babalyona or Babylon; some of them went still further west and south-west into Assyria (Asura-desa) and

Egypt, as far in fact as the Ionic isles of Greece ; while in the Indus Delta (Sindhu-kalaka) there long lived a tribe of Yavanas, of the same stock perhaps as the later Alexandrian Greeks, who invaded Sindh. Dravidian colonies, similarly, spread south-east and east, across the sea, to Ceylon, Indo-China, and Malaya, as far as Yava-dwipa (the island of Java). The political and social and cultural structures of Ancient Persia, Babylon, Egypt, Greece, as also of Malaya and Java reveal close affinities with the institutions of Ancient India, though in later times they all developed in their own way. These many forward movements had their reflex currents also ; and India became the coveted prize of every adventurous people commercially, of every ambitious monarch politically. Babylon and Egypt in the days of their glory had intimate trade relations with India. Semerimis of Ninevah invaded her in 2034 B.C., and Ramesis II in 981 B. C. The ancient Sakas (Persians) both before and after Darius (6th century B.C.) had their eyes and hands constantly at India. An era of a great Saka king is several times mentioned by the astronomer Varahamihira as having been 2526 years after Pandava Yudhishtira's death which, according to the Puranas took place in 26 Kali Era or 3076 B.C.; the Saka era should be therefore identified as that of Cyrus (Kurus), 550 B.C. The much-magnified invasion of India by Alexander was

in 327 B.C.; and Alexander's followers possibly found in the Indus Delta or Sindhu-Kalaka (Kal-Sindhu, Corindus) an ancient tribe of Yonas or Ionians. An Indian embassy visited Augustus Cæsar in 20 B.C. One of the first disciples of Jesus—and the religion of Jesus was only an adaptation of India's immemorial religion of God-love and Renunciation (Bhakti, and Vairagya) to the traditions prevailing in Israel—St. Thomas, travelling in all probability by the usual trade route along the coast, through Mesopotamia, Persia, and Makaran, and Guzerat and Konkan, found his way to South India, and is supposed to have died and to lie buried in St. Thomas Mount, near Madras. Rome under the Emperors carried a large trade with India. Ancient Babylon, Ninevah, Egypt, Persia, Israel, Greece and Rome—all have passed away: India still lives. "Their history is sought in their sepulchres; hers is still being written". Till 1000 A.D. India was wholly Hindu, though not under any one king or emperor even. After 1000 A.D. the Mohammedan invasions began; but her Mohammedan rulers soon became natives of India. During the past 300 years India has attracted the Portuguese and the Dutch, the French and the English. Thus as in far-off ages India's children spread far westwards and for eastwards, so in later times the children of other lands came to her—Assyrians, Persians, Greeks, Romans,

Afghans, Turkomans, and modern Europeans; and India has taken all in without losing her essential identity.

THE GOLDEN LINK:—Likewise under the Indian sun have met all the religions of the world—Hinduism in its manifold forms, and Zoroastrianism, and Judaism, Jainism and Buddhism, Christianity and Mohammedanism, and “scientific” Agnosticism. They have met to find mutual reconciliation. For, through the ages, India has stood for the supreme law of Unity in Diversity; her sages have declared unequivocally: “The One Existence the wise call by many names”. The discovery of the *Sutratma*—the Link that pervades and synthesises all forms of life and thought, and its practical application to the orderly growth of individuals and communities through what was long known and long honoured as the Varnashrama Dharma system, were among the highest achievements of Ancient India. And as long as her guardians of Dharma, especially her Kshatriya warriors and statesmen, in spite of internal rivalries, maintained their high ideals of chivalry and devotion to righteousness, so long India extended her influence on all sides, and stood invincible against all external foes. But time came when these guardians of Dharma deteriorated, when the Kshatriya armour of India fell to pieces, and non-Kshatriya dynasties of kings sprang up; and then

slowly foreign invasions and cults began to pour in. Even then, as the foundations had been laid deep, Dharma has continued to be cherished by people at large. Eminent schools of learning, and holy places of worship continued to flourish in several parts of the country. Religious and social reformers appeared from time to time from both orthodox and heterodox schools of thought. It was thus that the doctrines of Ahimsa (Non-violence), of Asanga (Non-attachment) and Nirvana (final emancipation) were preached by Jina Buddha first, and then by Gautama Buddha as deductions verily from the Sanatana Dhárma; and these doctrines were easily incorporated into the Orthodox Vedanta. Likewise, at a later day, in many parts of India, especially in the South, great Vaishnavite and Saivite seers and singers sowed broadcast, more by example than by precept, the highest ideals of spiritual Realisation, of God-love, Self-Surrender, and Service; these later were systematised in the philosophical works of Sankara, Ramanuja, and Madhava, in their commentaries on the common Vedanta. And because Indian seers from the very beginning had taught that several paths all lead to the same goal, therefore neither Christianity nor Mohammedanism, in spite of their militant propaganda, brought anything new to those well posted in Vedantic teachings. On the other hand, Christianity appeared only to be the Vaishnava's

religion of God-love, of cheerful surrender to God's boundless and all-purifying Grace. Likewise Islam appeared in essence to be, though under a different name, the same as the Dwaita creed of unquestioning obedience to the Will of the All-knowing All-powerful God. Nay, philosophy apart, there were God-seers at first hand, like Ramakrishna Paramahansa, who realised the same inexpressible rapture of at-one-ness with God alike through Hinduism and through Christianity and through Islam. So far, then, no particular creed has been able to overthrow the universalism of the Vedanta. Is "scientific" agnosticism, which in the last century exploded the formal theology of the West, likely to triumph over the deep spirituality of India? The answer must be in the negative ; for as long as the Vedanta is the Science of the changeless Spirit, so long no science of changing Matter can overthrow it ; on the other hand, the highest science of matter must find its explanation and culmination in the Light furnished by the Science of the Spirit. This culmination is needed urgently to solve the problems of the day ; for, as we have seen, the mechanisation of human life brought about by the superficial materialism of the last generation threatens now to deluge the world. It is now for India to show, and for England to spread among all nations the Light of true Swaraj and Harmony whether in individual or in group life.
